General Ecology: Life Death on Earth in Derrida and Others

Philippe Lynes

A Thesis

In the Department

of

Humanities

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy (Humanities) at

Concordia University

Montréal, Québec, Canada

September 2016

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Philippe Lynes

Entitled: General Ecology: Life Death on Earth in Derrida and Others

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy (Humanities)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final Examining Committee:

Dr. Greg M. Nielsen Chair

Dr. David Wills External Examiner

Dr. Emilia Angelova External to Program

Dr. Amy Swiffen Examiner

Dr. Pier-Pascale Boulanger Examiner

Dr. Matthias Fritsch Thesis Supervisor

Approved by

Dr. Bina Freiwald
Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

Dr. André Roy
Dean of Faculty

ABSTRACT

General Ecology: Life Death on Earth in Derrida and Others

Philippe Lynes, Ph.D.

Life on earth is currently approaching or undergoing what has been called the sixth mass extinction, also known as the Holocene or anthropocene extinction. Unlike the previous five, this extinction is due to the destructive practices of a single species, our own. Along with the up to 50% of plant and animal species facing extinction by the year 2100, as many as 90% of the world's languages are expected to meet the same fate by this time. Biocultural diversity is a recent appellation for thinking together the earth's biological, cultural and linguistic diversity, the related causes of their extinctions and the related steps needing to be taken to ensure their sustainability. In this dissertation, I turn to the work of Jacques Derrida to propose a notion of 'general ecology' as a way to respond to this loss, to think the ethics, ontology and epistemology at stake in biocultural sustainability and the life and death we differentially share on earth with its others. Through readings of a variety of contemporary continental philosophers, I develop the interdisciplinary applicability of general ecology in the areas of translation studies, biopolitics, science and technology studies and ecolinguistics. My hope is to give readers not only an appreciation of the ecological and biocultural stakes of deconstruction, but to provoke in them new ways of thinking a more just sharing of the earth.

MATTHIAS FRITSCH
in Verehrung und Freundschaft zugeeignet
Pour la vie, c'est à dire…,

for
JENNIFER SCHADE
for her love and unwavering support,

and for
FRANKY AND SCHMOO
my research assistants, *le mort/la vivante*. Meow, meow.

I'd like to begin by thanking Bina Freiwald, Sharon Fitch and everyone else in the Humanities department at Concordia University for taking a chance on this project, along with everyone in the philosophy department for hosting me. Pier-Pascale Boulanger for her encouragement and faith from the start, and Amy Swiffen for kindly accepting to join my committee at such a late stage. Matthew Barker, Kevin Gould, Donald Landes and Greg Nielsen also provided invaluable advice along the way. Finally, Emilia Angelova and David Wills for their kindness in agreeing to evaluate this dissertation. I'd also like to thank my family, particularly my sister Krista Lynes and her partner Jonathan Weiss (and their boys Xavier and Nico) for helping me navigate the perils of doctoral work, and whose ideas are present in these pages in more ways than I can account for. My mother, Denise Garneau, especially for the gift of the French language and for granting me a peaceful refuge while preparing these chapters. My sister Émilie Lynes and her husband Shawn for laughter and friendship. My father Jim Lynes, his wife Bev Jensen and my stepsisters Hilary and Lindsay and their partners. My mother-in-law Dr. Rosemarie Schade and all at the Loyola College for Diversity and Sustainability, my sister-in-law Marta Schade and their friend George McGinnis. My close friends have been a source of constant inspiration and joy in their willingness to engage many of the ideas in this dissertation, particularly Dylan Nassr, for whose careful reading, editing and comments on earlier drafts of these chapters I am eternally grateful. Jeffrey Beasley, Brendan Demontigny, Michael Foley, Michael Folkerson, Simon Honeyman, Daniel Morison and Roger Nutbey also deserve acknowledgement. I'd also like to thank David Wood and everyone involved with the Eco-Deconstruction project, along with all at Fordham University Press. Peggy Kamuf, Ellie Anderson and everyone else at the Derrida Seminars Translation Project. Cary Wolfe and all at the University of Minnesota Press. Timothy Clark and all at the Oxford Literary Review. All those at the Critical Theory Archives at UC Irvine, at the IMEC in Caen, France, and all the friends I've made along the way at SPEP, IAEP, Derrida Today and the Society for Biopolitical Futures. None of this, however, would have been possible without the care, insight, generosity, intelligence and friendship of Matthias Fritsch, who pushed my work to be the best it could be, and to whom I owe more than I can ever repay. Finally, my partner Jenny for her seemingly infinite patience in allowing me to bounce ideas off her over these seven years and for her love, kindness and creative inspiration. And my fuzzy feline 'research assistants' Franky and Schmoo for slow blinks and head-butts when I needed them the most.

LA TERRE

Le mort
saisit le vif

et l'oiseau ferme la marche.[1]

Georges Bataille,
Œuvres complètes IV: Œuvres littéraires posthumes, 29/39.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Page numbers first refer to the original French or German text, then to the English translation. Translations have been modified where necessary to ensure consistency in vocabulary. I have provided translations from the French where no published versions exist, all errors in translation therein being, of course, my own. Translations, whether modified or my own, will be indicated with a lowercase, italicized *t*. A lowercase, italicized *e* denotes a modification of emphasis.

Works by Georges Bataille

OC4: *Œuvres complètes IV: Œuvres littéraires posthumes* (Paris, Gallimard, 1971); relevant texts (p) trans. Mark Spitzer as *The Collected Poems of Georges Bataille* (Chester Springs, Dufour Editions, 1999).

OC5: *Œuvres complètes V: La Somme athéologique Tome I* (Paris, Gallimard, 1973); relevant texts (g) trans. Bruce Boone as *Guilty* (Venice, The Lapis Press, 1988); (i) trans. Leslie Anne Boldt as *Inner Experience* (Albany, SUNY Press, 1988); (u) trans. Michelle Kendall and Stuart Kendall as *The Unfinished System of Nonknowledge* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2001).

OC6: *Œuvres complètes VI: La Somme athéologique Tome II* (Paris, Gallimard, 1973); relevant texts (n) trans. Bruce Boone as *On Nietzsche* (London, Continuum, 2004).

OC7: *Œuvres complètes VII* (Paris, Gallimard, 1976); relevant texts (a) trans. Robert Hurley as *The Accursed Share: An Essay on General Economy, Volume I: Consumption* (New York, Zone Books, 1991); (r) *The Bataille Reader* (Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 1997).

Works by Antoine Berman

BA: *L'Âge de la traduction: 'La tâche du traducteur' de Walter Benjamin, un commentaire* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 2008).

BD: *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne*. (Paris: Gallimard, 1995); trans. Françoise Massardier-Kenney as *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne* (Kent, Kent State University Press, 2009).

BE: *L'Épreuve de l'étranger. Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique: Herder, Goethe, Schlegel, Novalis, Humboldt, Schleiermacher, Hölderlin* (Paris, Gallimard, 1984); trans. S. Heyvaert as *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany* (Albany, State University of New York Press, 1992).

BT: *La Traduction et la lettre ou l'auberge du lointain* (Paris, Seuil, 1999).

Works by Maurice Blanchot

BCI: *La Communauté inavouable* (Paris, Minuit, 1984); trans. Pierre Joris as *The Unavowable Community* (Barrytown, Station Hill Press, 1988).

BED: *L'Écriture du désastre* (Paris, Gallimard, 1980); trans. Ann Smock as *The Writing of the Disaster* (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1995).

BEI: *L'Entretien infini* (Paris, Gallimard, 1968); trans. Susan Hanson as *The Infinite Conversation* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

BEL: *L'Espace littéraire* (Paris, Gallimard, 1955); trans. Ann Smock as *The Space of Literature* (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1982).

BPA: *Le Pas au-delà* (Paris, Gallimard, 1973); trans. Lycette Nelson as *The Step Not Beyond* (Albany, State University of New York Press, 1992).

BPF: *La Part du feu* (Paris, Gallimard, 1949); trans. Charlotte Mandell as *The Work of Fire* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1995).

BVA: *Une Voix venue d'ailleurs* (Paris, Gallimard, 2002); trans. Charlotte Mandell as *A Voice from Elsewhere* (Albany, State University of New York Press, 2005).

Works by Georges Canguilhem

CC: *La Connaissance de la vie: Deuxième edition revue et augmentée* (Paris, Vrin, 2003); trans. Stefanos Groulanos and Daniela Ginsburg as *Knowledge of Life* (New York, Fordham University Press, 2008).

CE: *Études d'histoire et de philosophie des sciences: Troisième Édition* (Paris, Vrin, 1975).

CN: *Le Normal et le pathologique, augmenté de Nouvelles Réflexions concernant le normal et le pathologique* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 2005); trans. Carolyn R. Fawcett and Robert S. Cohen as *The Normal and the Pathological* (New York, Zone Books, 1991).

Works by Gilles Deleuze (and Félix Guattari)

DF: *Deux régimes de fous: Textes et entretiens 1975-1995*. (Paris, Minuit, 2003); trans. Ames Hodges and Mike Aormina as *Two Regimes of Madness: Texts and Interviews 1975-1995*. (New York, Semiotext(e), 2006).

DR: *Différence et répétition* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1968); trans. Paul Patton as *Difference and Repetition* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1994).

F: *Foucault* (Paris, Minuit, 1986); trans. Seán Hand as *Foucault* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1988).

ID: *L'Île déserte: Textes et entretiens 1953-1974* (Paris, Minuit, 2002); trans. Michael Taormina as *Desert Islands and Other Texts 1953-1974* (New York, Semiotext(e), 2004).

LS: *Logique du sens* (Paris, Minuit, 1969); trans. Mark Lester as *The Logic of Sense* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1990).

MPl: *Capitalisme et schizophrénie 2: Mille plateaux*. (Paris, Minuit, 1980); trans. Brian Massumi as *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1987).

N: *Nietzsche* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1965); trans. Anne Boyman as "Nietzsche" in *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life* (New York, Zone Books, 2001).

NP: *Nietzsche et la philosophie* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1962); trans. Hugh Tomlinson as *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (New York, Columbia University Press, 2006).

PP: *Pourparlers: 1972-1990* (Paris, Minuit, 1990); trans. Martin Joughin as *Negotiations: 1972-1990* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1995).

QP: *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?* (Paris, Minuit, 2005); trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchill as *What is Philosophy?* (London, Verso, 1994).

SPE: *Spinoza et le problème de l'expression* (Paris, Minuit, 1968); trans. Martin Joughin as *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza* (New York, Zone Books, 1992).

SPP: *Spinoza: Philosophie pratique* (Paris, Minuit, 2003); trans. Robert Hurley as *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy* (San Francisco, City Light Books, 1988).

Works by Jacques Derrida

A: *Apories* (Paris, Galilée, 1996); trans. Thomas Dutoit as *Aporias* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1993).

AEL: *Adieu à Emmanuel Levinas* (Paris, Galilée, 1997); trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas as *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1999).

AL: "Derrida avec Lévinas: 'entre lui et moi dans l'affection et la confiance partagée,'" *Le Magazine Littéraire* (2003): 1-6.

ALT: *Altérités* (Paris, Osiris, 1986); trans. Stefan Herbrechter as "Alterities" in *Parallax* 10,4 (2004).

AS: *L'Animal que donc je suis* (Paris, Galilée, 2006); trans. David Wills as *The Animal that Therefore I Am* (New York, Fordham University Press, 2008).

AV: "Avances" preface to Serge Margel, *Le Tombeau du dieu artisan* (Paris, Minuit, 1995).

AVE: *Apprendre à vivre enfin: Entretien avec Jean Birnbaum* (Paris, Galilée, 2005); trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas as *Learning to Live Finally: The Last Interview* (New York, Palgrave McMillan, 2007).

AWD: *Arguing with Derrida* (Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 2001).

B: *Séminaire: Walter Benjamin*, unpublished.

BS1: *Séminaire: La Bête et le souverain: Volume I (2001-2002)* (Paris, Galilée, 2008); trans. Geoffrey Bennington as *The Beast & the Sovereign Volume II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

BS2: *Séminaire: La Bête et le souverain: Volume II (2002-2003)* (Paris, Galilée, 2010); trans. Geoffrey Bennington as *The Beast & the Sovereign Volume II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).

CH: *La Conférence de Heidelberg (1988): Heidegger: Portée philosophique et politique de sa pensée* (Paris, Lignes, 2014).

CP: *La Carte postale: De Socrate à Freud et au-delà* (Paris, Flammarion, 1980); trans. Alan Bass as *The Post Card: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1987).

CU: *Chaque fois unique, la fin du monde* (Paris, Galilée, 2003); ed. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas as *The Work of Mourning* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2001).

DB: *Demeure: Maurice Blanchot* (Paris, Galilée, 1998); trans. Elizabeth Rottenberg as *Demeure: Fiction and Testimony* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2000).

DDP: *Du Droit à la philosophie* (Paris, Galilée, 1990); 2 English volumes, 1 trans. Jan Plug as *Who's Afraid of Philosophy: Right to Philosophy 1* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2002), 2 trans. Jan Plug and others as *Eyes of the University: Right to Philosophy 2* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2004).

DE: *Heidegger et la question: De l'Esprit et autres essais* (Paris, Champs Essais, 2010); trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby as *Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1989).

DG: *De la grammatologie* (Paris, Minuit, 1967); trans Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak as *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974).

DH: *De l'hospitalité: Anne Dufourmantelle invite Jacques Derrida à répondre* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1997); trans. Rachel Bowlby as *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2000)

DJ: *Le Dernier des Juifs* (Paris, Galilée, 2014).

DM: *Donner la mort* (Paris, Galilée, 1999); trans. David Wills as *The Gift of Death and Literature in Secret: Second Edition* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2008).

DN: *Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida*, ed. John Caputo (New York, Fordham University Press, 1997).

DP: *Dire l'événement, est-ce possible?* (Paris, L'Harmattan, 2001), trans. Gila Walker as "A Certain Impossible Possibility of Saying the Event," *Critical Inquiry* 33 (2007): 441-461.

DQ: *De Quoi Demain... Dialogue (Avec Elisabeth Roudinesco)* (Paris, Fayard/Galilée, 2001); trans. Jeff Fort as *For What Tomorrow* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2004).

DS: *Deconstruction Engaged: the Sydney Seminars* (Power Publications, Sydney, 2006).

DT: *Donner: Le Temps 1. La Fausse monnaie* (Paris, Galilée, 1991); trans. Peggy Kamuf as *Given Time: 1. Counterfeit Money* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1992).

É: *Éperons: Les Styles de Nietzsche/ Spurs: Nietzsche's Styles* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1978).

EA: "Autour des écrits de Jacques Derrida sur l'argent" in *L'Argent*, edited by Marcel Drach (Paris, La Découverte, 2004), 201-232.

ED: *L'Écriture et la différence* (Paris, Seuil, 1967); trans. Alan Bass as *Writing and Difference* (London, Routledge Classics, 2001).

ET: *Échographies de la télévision: Entretiens filmés* (Paris, Galilée/INA, 1996); trans. Jennifer Bajorek as *Echographies of Television: Filmed Interviews* (Cambridge, Polity, 2002).

ETC: "Et Cetera... (and so on, und so weiter, and so forth, et ainsi de suite, und so überall, etc.) in *L'Herne: Derrida* (Paris, L'Herne, 2004).

FA: "Fors: Les mots anglés de Nicolas Abraham et Maria Torok" in Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok, *La Verbier des hommes aux loups* (Paris, Flammarion, 1976); trans. Barbara Johnson as "*Fors*: the Anglish Words of Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok" in Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok, *Wolf Man's Magic Word: A Cryptonomy* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2005).

FF: “La forme et la façon (plus jamais : envers et contre tout, ne plus jamais penser ça ‘pour la forme’” préface à Alain David, *Racisme et antisémitisme: Essai de philosophie sur l’envers de concepts* (Paris, Ellipses, 2001).

FL: *Force de loi* (Paris, Galilée, 1994); trans. Mary Quintance as “Force of Law” in *Acts of Religion* (New York, Routledge, 2002), 228-298.

FP: “Fidélité à plus d’un: Mériter d’hériter où la généalogie fait défaut.” in *Idiomes, Nationalités, Déconstructions: Rencontre de Rabat avec Jacques Derrida* (Casablanca, Les Éditions Toubkal, 1998).

FS: *Foi et Savoir, suivi de Le Siècle et le Pardon* (Paris, Seuil, 2000); trans. Samuel Weber as “Faith and Knowledge: Two Sources of ‘Religion’ at the Limits of Reason Alone” in *Acts of Religion* (New York, Routledge, 2002), 40-101.

FSC: *For Strasbourg: Conversations of Friendship and Philosophy* ed. and trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas (New York, Fordham University Press, 2014).

G: *Glas (2 tomes)* (Paris, Denoël-Gonthier, 1981); trans. John P. Leavey and Richard Rand as *Glas* (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1986).

HC: *H. C. pour la vie, c’est à dire…* (Paris, Galilée, 2002); trans. Laurent Milesi and Stefan Herbrechter as *H.C. for Life, That Is to Say* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2006).

HF: “Interviews of July 1 and November 22, 1999” in Dominique Janicaud, *Heidegger in France* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2015).

HJR: “Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility: A dialogue with Jacques Derrida” in Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley, eds. *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy* (London, Routledge, 1999), 65-83.

HQ: *Heidegger: La Question de l’Être et l’histoire* (Paris, Galilée, 2013); trans. Geoffrey Bennington as *Heidegger: The Question of Being & History* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2016).

IOG: “Introduction” à *L’Origine de la géométrie* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1962); trans. John P. Leavey, Jr. as *Edmund Husserl’s Origin of Geometry: An Introduction* (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1989).

L: *Séminaire: La Vie la mort 1974-5*, unpublished.

LD: *La Dissémination* (Paris, Seuil, 1972); trans. Barbara Johnson as *Dissemination* (London, Athlone Press, 1981).

LI: *Limited Inc.* (Paris, Galilée, 1990); trans. Elisabeth Weber as *Limited Inc* (Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 1988).

LT: *Le Toucher, Jean-Luc Nancy* (Paris, Galilée, 2000); trans. Christine Irizzary as *On Touching – Jean-Luc Nancy* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2005).

LV: *Lengua por venir/ Langue à venir: Seminario de Barcelone* (Barcelona, Icaria, 2004).

MA: "La Mélancholie d'Abraham." *Les Temps Modernes* 669-670 (2012-3): 30-66.

MAP: *Le Monolinguisme de l'autre ou la prothèse d'origine* (Paris, Galilée, 1996); trans. Patrick Mensah as *Monolingualism of the Other or The Prosthesis of Origin* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1998.

MH: *De l'hospitalité: Autour du travail de Jacques Derrida* (Vénissieux, La Passe du Vent, 2001).

MP: *Marges: De la philosophie* (Paris, Minuit, 1972); trans. Alan Bass as *Margins of Philosophy* (Brighton, Harvester Press, 1982).

MPD: *Mémoires: Pour Paul de Man* (Paris, Galilée, 1988); trans. Cecile Lindsay et. al. as *Memoires for Paul de Man: Revised Edition* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1989).

MS: *Marx & Sons* (Paris, Galilée/Presses universitaires de France, 2002); trans. G.M. Goshgarian as "Marx & Sons" in *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida's* Spectres of Marx, ed. Michael Sprinkler (London, Verso, 2008), 213-269.

NG: "Nous autres grecs" in *Nos grecs et leur modernes*, Barbara Cassin ed. (Paris, Seuil, 1992); trans. Pascale Anne Brault and Michael Nass in *Derrida and Antiquity* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010), 18-39.

NII: *Negotiations: Interventions and Interviews 1971-2002* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2002).

OA: *L'Oreille de l'autre: Otobiographies, transferts, traductions* (VLB Éditeur, Montréal, 1982); trans. Peggy Kamuf as *The Ear of the Other: Otobiography, Transference, Translation* (Shocken Books, New York, 1985).

P: *Parages* (Paris, Galilée, 1986); trans. Tom Conley et. al. as *Parages* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2011).

PA: *Politiques de l'amitié* (Paris, Galilée, 1994); trans. George Collins as *The Politics of Friendship* (London, Verso, 2005).

PC: "Performative Powerlessness – A Response to Simon Critchley," *Constellations* 7,4 (2000): 466-8.

PCM: “La Phénoménologie et la clôture de la métaphysique: Introduction à la pensée de Husserl” *Alter, Revue de phénoménologie* 8 (2000) trans. Ronald Bruzina as “Phenomenology and the Closure of Metaphysics: Introduction to the Thought of Husserl” in *The New Yearbook for Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy* III (2003).

PD: “La Parole: Donner, nommer, appeler” in *Les Cahiers de l’Herne: Ricoeur*. (Paris, L’Herne, 2004); trans. Eftichis Pirovolakis as “The Word: Giving, Naming, Calling” in Eftichis Pirovolakis, *Reading Derrida and Ricoeur: Improbably Encounters between Deconstruction and Hermeneutics* (Albany, SUNY Press, 2010).

PDS: *Points de suspension: Entretiens* (Paris, Galilée, 1992); trans. Peggy Kamuf and others as *Points... Interviews, 1974-1994.* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1995).
PE: *Positions: Entretiens* (Paris, Minuit, 1972); trans. Alan Bass as *Positions* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1981).

PG: *Le Problème de la genèse dans la philosophie de Husserl* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1990); trans. Marian Hobson as *The Problem of Genesis in Husserl’s Philosophy* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2003).

PM: *Papier Machine* (Paris, Galilée, 2001); trans. Rachel Bowlby as *Paper Machine* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2005).

PM1: *Séminaire: La Peine de mort: Volume 1 (1999-2000*) (Paris, Galilée, 2012); trans. Peggy Kamuf as *The Death Penalty: Volume 1* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2014).

PM2: *Séminaire: La Peine de mort: Volume 1 (2000-2001*) (Paris, Galilée, 2015).

PV: *Penser à ne pas voir: Écrits sur les arts du visible 1979-2004.* (Paris, Éditions de la différence, 2013).

P1: *Psyché: Inventions de l’autre (tome 1)* (Paris, Galilée, 1997); eds. Peggy Kamuf and Elizabeth Rottenberg as *Psyche: Inventions of the Other Volume I* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2007).

P2: *Psyché: Inventions de l’autre (tome 2)* (Paris, Galilée, 2003); eds. Peggy Kamuf and Elizabeth Rottenberg as *Psyche: Inventions of the Other Volume II* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2008).

QF: “Que Faire – de la question ‘Que faire?’ – ?” in *Derrida pour les temps à venir*, ed. René Major (Paris, Stock, 2007), 45-62.

RP: *Résistances: De la psychanalyse* (Paris, Galilée, 1996); trans. Peggy Kamuf, Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas as *Resistances of Psychoanalysis* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1998).

SM: *Spectres de Marx* (Paris, Galilée, 1993); trans. Peggy Kamuf as *Spectres of Marx* (New York, Routledge Classics, 2006).

SP: *Sur parole: Instantanées philosophiques*. (La Tour-d'Aigues, Éditions de l'Aube, 1999).

SQ: *Sovereignties in Question: The Poetics of Paul Celan* (New York, Fordham University Press, 2005).

TR: "Qu'est-ce qu'une traduction 'relevante'?" in *Les Cahiers de l'Herne: Derrida*. (Paris, L'Herne, 2004); trans. Lawrence Venuti as "What is a 'Relevant' Translation?" in *Critical Inquiry* 27:2, 2001.

TS: *A Taste for the Secret* (Cambridge, Polity, 2002).

UG: *Ulysse gramophone* (Paris, Galilée, 1987); trans. Tina Kendall as "Ulysses Gramophone" in *Acts of Literature* (New York, Routledge, 1992).

V: *Voyous* (Paris, Galilée, 2003); trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas as *Rogues* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2005).

VeP: *La Vérité en peinture* (Paris, Flammarion, 1978); trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Ian Mcleod as *The Truth in Painting* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1987).

VP: *La Voix et le phénomène* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1967); trans. Leonard Lawlor as *Voice and Phenomenon* (Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 2011).

WA: *Without Alibi* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2002).

WC: "Who or What is Compared? The Concept of Comparative Literature and the Theoretical Problems of Translation." *Discourse* 30.1 and 30.2 (2008), 22-53.

Works by Michel Foucault

DE1-4: *Dits et écrits 1954-1988: 4 tomes*. (Paris, Gallimard, 1994); all relevant texts trans. Robert Hurley and Others in *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault Volume 2: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. (New York, The New Press, 1998).

IF: *"Il faut défendre la société" : Cours au Collège de France, 1976.* (Paris, Seuil/Gallimard, 1997); trans. David Macey as *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-6*. (New York, Picador, 2003).

MC: *Les Mots et les choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines* (Paris, Gallimard, 1966); trans. Anonymous as *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London, Routledge Classics, 2002).

NC: *Naissance de la clinique* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1963); trans. A.M. Sheridan as *The Birth of the Clinic: An Aracheology of Medical Perception* (London, Routledge, 2003).

VS: *Histoire de la sexualité 1: La Volonté de savoir* (Paris, Gallimard, 1976); trans. Robert Hurley as *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction* (New York, Pantheon Books, 1978).

Works by Roberto Esposito (page numbers refer solely to English translations).

E3: *Terza Persona: Politica della vita e filosofia dell'impersonale* (Turin, Guilio Einaudi editore, 2007); trans. Zakiya Hanafi as *Third Person: Politics of Life and Philosophy of the Impersonal* (London, Polity, 2012).

EB: *Bíos: Biopolitica e filosofia* (Turin, Guilio Einaudi editore, 2004); trans. Timothy Campbell as *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

EC: *Communitas: Origine e destino della communità* (Turin, Guilio Einaudi Editore, 1998); trans. Timothy Campbell as *Communitas: The Origin and Destiny of Community* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2010).

ECI: *Categorie dell' impolitico* (Bologna, Società editrice il Mulino, 1999); trans. Connal Parsley as *Categories of the Impolitical* (New York, Fordham University Press, 2015).

EI: *Immunitas: Protezione e negazione della vita* (Turin, Guilio Einaudi Editore, 2002); trans. Zakiya Hanafi as *Immunitas: The Protection and Negation of Life* (Cambridge, Polity, 2013).

ET: *Termini della Politica. Communità, immunitià, biopolitica* (Milano, Mimesis Edizione, 2008); trans. Rhiannon Noel Welch as *Terms of the Political: Community, Immunity, Biopolitics* (New York, Fordham University Press, 2013).

Works by Michael Hardt and/or Antonio Negri

HD: *Gilles Deleuze: An Apprenticeship in Philosophy* (London, UCL Press, 1993).

HNC: *Commonwealth* (Cambridge, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009).

HNE: *Empire* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2000).

HNL: *Labour of Dionysus: A Critique of State Form* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1994).

HNM: *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York, Penguin Press, 2004).

NOB: “At the Origins of Biopolitics” in *Biopower: Foucault and Beyond*, ed. Vernon W. Cisney and Nicolae Morar (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2016), 48-64.

NSS: “The Specter’s Smile” in *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida’s* Spectres of Marx, ed. Michael Sprinkler (London, Verso, 2008), 5-16.

Works by Martin Heidegger

GA *2*: *Sein und Zeit* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1977); trans. John MacQuarrie and Edward Robinson (New York, Harper Perennial, 2008).

GA *3*: *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1991); trans. Richard Taft as *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1997).

GA *5*: *Holzwege* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1977); trans. Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes as *Off the Beaten Track* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002).

GA *6.1*: *Nietzsche: Erster Band* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1996); trans. David Farrell Krell et. al. as *Nietzsche* [four volumes] (San Francisco, Harper San Francisco, 1991).

GA *6.2*: *Nietzsche: Zweiter Band* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1997); trans David Farrell Krell et. al. as *Nietzsche* [four volumes] (San Francisco, Harper San Francisco, 1991).

GA *7*: *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 2000); relevant material trans. David Farrell Krell as “Who is Nietzsche’s Zarathustra?” in *Nietzsche: Volume II: The Eternal Recurrence of the Same* (San Francisco, Harper San Francisco, 1991) and “Building Dwelling Thinking” in *Basic Writings* (New York, Harper & Row, 1977).

GA *9*: *Wegmarken* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1976); ed. William McNeill as *Pathmarks* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998).

GA *12*: *Unterwegs zur Sprache* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1985); trans. Peter D. Hertz as *On the Way to Language* (New York, Harper & Row, 1971).

GA *20*: *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1979); trans. Theodore Kisiel as *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1985).

GA *24*: *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1975); trans. Albert Hofstadter as *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1982).

GA *26*: *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik im Ausgang von Leibniz* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1978); trans. Michael Heim as *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1984).

GA *29-30*. *Die Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik: Welt – Endlichkeit – Einsamkeit* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1983); trans. William McNeill and Nicholas Walker as *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*. (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1995).

GA *40*: *Einführung in die Metaphysik* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1983); trans. Gregory Fried and Michael Polt as *Introduction to Metaphysics* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2000).

GA *65*: *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1989); trans. Richard Rojcewicz and Daniela Vallega-Neu as *Contributions to Philosophy (Of the Event*) (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2012).

Works by Edmund Husserl

EU: *Erfahrung und Urteil: Untersuchungen zur Genealogie der Logik*. (Prague, Academia/Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939) trans. Karl Ameriks and James Churchill as *Experience and Judgment* (Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 1975).

Hua 1: *Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1973); trans. Dorion Cairns as *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1960).

Hua 3: *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Erstes Buch: Allgemeine Einführungin die reine Phänomenologie* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1977); trans. W.R. Boyce Gibson as *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology* (London, Routledge Classics, 2012).

Hua 10: *Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstesens (1893-1917).* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1969); trans. John Barnett Brough as *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1873-1917)* (Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991).

Hua 11: *Analysen zur passiven Synthesis. Aus Vorlesungs- und Forschungsmanuskripten, 1918-1926* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1966); trans. Anthony J. Steinbock as *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis: Lectures on Transcendental Logic* (Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Press, 2001).

Hua 17: *Formale and transzendentale Logik. Versuch einer Kritik der logischen Vernunft* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1974); trans. Dorion Cairns as *Formal and Transcendental Logic* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1969).

Hua M 8: *Späte Texte über Zeitkonstitution (1929-1934): Die C-Manuskripte* (Dordrecht, Springer, 2006).

Introduction: Life Death on Earth with Others

We are currently approaching (or undergoing, depending who you ask) what many have referred to as the sixth mass extinction, also known as the Holocene or Anthropocene extinction. While species extinction is certainly a fact of life (scientists estimate that 95% of all species that have ever lived are now extinct), it has been argued that species are dying out at a rate 1000 to 10,000 times faster than the normal or 'background' rate, with up to 50% of all species facing extinction by the year 2050.[1] Unlike the previous five extinctions, this is the first due to the effects of the actions of a single species: our own, human beings. 99% of species currently threatened are said to be so because of anthropogenic climate change, habitat destruction and the introduction of foreign species into their balanced ecosystems.[2] The journal *Nature* currently lists 41% of amphibians, 26% of mammals and 13% of birds as currently under threat of extinction.[3] However, it is impossible to accurately know the extent at which this extinction is undergoing, since of the estimated 8.7 million species on earth today, only less than 20% have been 'discovered' (or catalogued in the annals of biology).[4] Another study in *Nature* lists as many as 21.4 million possible species of animals, fungi and plants with only 1.8 million described, while yet another recent study includes microbial life in positing a possible one trillion species on Earth, with only one thousandth of a percent identified.[5]

A related challenge is currently facing the world's languages, the most widely cited study from 1992 proposing the loss of as many as 90% of languages by the year 2100, with more recent estimates placing this figure somewhat more optimistically at 50%.[6] *National Geographic* calculates that a language dies every fourteen days.[7] Like biological species, it is difficult to say how many languages exist, with an average figure of around 6 to 7000 (and as many as 10, 000) usually proposed, with perhaps as many sign languages. *Ethnologue* currently lists 6,809 languages, 95% of which have fewer than 1 million speakers.[8] Another study claims that of all the world's languages, some 5,000 have less than 100,000 speakers, 3,000 less than 10,000 speakers, 1,500 less than 1,000 speakers, and 500 less than 100 speakers.[9] 4 to 5,000 of all languages are indigenous and endemic to a single country and ecosystem, spoken by a very small number of people, and their loss thereby also entails that of an entire culture and of a wholly singular manner of relating to the world. As a report jointly released by UNESCO (The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), the WWF (The World Wide Fund for Nature) and Terralingua, an organization committed to biocultural diversity puts it, "languages

have been called 'the DNA of cultures' – they have encoded the cultural knowledge that people have inherited from their ancestors, and each generation continues to add to this heritage."[10] And while a certain amount of language extinction and evolution has also always occurred, one can read the intensification of this process as bound up with the causes responsible for species loss: environmental degradation and climate change, which operate alongside the displacement of indigenous communities and the hegemony of Anglo-American popular culture in the globalization of capitalism. Global capitalism requires unencumbered translation and thus fosters the increasing spread of English and other 'mega-languages' whereby traditional languages and knowledge systems are abandoned, either willingly as a means of survival or as a result of violent coercion. (Mandarin Chinese, Hindi, Spanish, Bengali, Portuguese, Arabic, Russian, Japanese and German constitute less than 1% of all world languages, but are spoken by 95% of its population, 50% of which as a mother tongue). Donna Haraway in fact suggests we substitute the term *Capitalocene* for anthropocene, and it is precisely in an attempt to break with the *oikos* of the 'restricted economy' of the capitalocene that I propose general ecology as the framework for what I will call biocultural sustainability.

It is surprising, given the increasing amount of interest in what can be called posthumanist discourses in responding to the anthropocene – highlighting the necessity to go beyond the classical metaphysical oppositions of culture and nature, the human and its others, the inorganic and the organic – that more attention has not been given to thinking biological, cultural and linguistic diversity as mutually and inextricably threatened. Biocultural diversity is defined as "the diversity of life in all its manifestations – biological, cultural, and linguistic – which are interrelated within a complex socio-ecological adaptive system."[11] Throughout these chapters, I will argue that the loss of this diversity is something to be grieved and mourned, as much for its own sake as for the fact that the ecosystems most capable of enduring and living-on are those characterized by difference and diversity.[12] Ethics and ontology are thus inextricably bound up one with the other when it comes to thinking life and death on earth with its others. Preserving biocultural diversity is both the right thing to do and what we must do if we want to keep on living together well.

Deconstruction, at least as it is usually understood by the layperson or non-philosophers in general, will perhaps seem a strange way to think biocultural sustainability since its name evokes something like taking something apart or breaking it down. This is, however, quite

misleading. An even cursory reading of the work of Jacques Derrida reveals that questions of life, death, 'nature,' the earth and ethics have been present from his earliest texts and have remained at the forefront of his thought throughout his career. Derrida has always been a thinker of life, and particularly of life-supporting contexts, and so always a thinker of life on earth for me. A growing interest in deconstruction and environmental ethics or philosophy has sprung up since David Wood's landmark paper "Spectres of Derrida: On the Way to Econstruction."[13] Three special issues of the *Oxford Literary Review* edited by Timothy Clark, "Deconstruction, Environmentalism, and Climate Change," (2010) "Deconstruction in the Anthropocene" (2012) and more recently "Overpopulation" (2016) have also contributed to this scholarship.[14] In 2015, following an eponymous conference at Vanderbilt in Nashville, Tennessee, Matthias Fritsch, David Wood and myself edited *Eco-Deconstruction: Derrida and Environmental Philosophy*, which is currently under review by Fordham University Press. Eco-deconstruction closely follows on the tradition of eco-phenomenology, and both approximate certain reflections on the human's place in nature present in European thought since German romanticism. The tradition of (more continental) environmental philosophy has itself long been recognized as a worthwhile alternative to the (more analytic) approach of environmental ethics, although to argue for its preferability over the latter is not my primary concern here.[15]

Why, then, do we need to think ecology philosophically or theoretically? The very idea could seem at best a futile piece of academic navel-gazing by sustainability activists, conservation biologists or those militating for linguistic human rights, at worst something wholly complicit with the mechanisms responsible for biocultural degradation in its privileged position within the institution of higher academia, its drawing largely from white, European men and its use of almost 400 pages of paper really to say (in English) that what is happening is bad and we should try to do something differently. I don't refuse this possible contamination, which makes the stakes of this project all the more difficult, risky and vexing. However, I don't believe the oppositions between theory and practice, activity and passivity are as stable as such arguments might allow, nor do I see the lines between philosophy, linguistics, science, ethics and politics as clearly drawn as others believe them to be. Actually, I think such oppositions and distinctions in fact prevent an adequate epistemological, ontological and ethical apprehension of what it means to live and die on earth with others. My thought, then, is that we're for the most part quite bad at thinking what ecology is and means, given that despite the harrowing statistics I've listed above,

the worst-case scenario no longer seems one we'll be able to avoid even if we straighten up and fly right. Furthermore, it seems to me that much in current theoretical thinking about life on earth and ecology reiterates many of the mechanisms responsible for biocultural degradation, namely a humanist subjectivism and a fetishizing of techno-capitalism, often despite (and perhaps due to) affirming its purity from these. Conversely, I intend to work through this contamination to flesh out its traps. As perilous as such a journey may be, it is one I see as absolutely worthwhile.

Relatedly, it will further seem problematic to some that a study concerned with biocultural sustainability will place such an emphasis in its analyses on death. But this isn't a very rigorous criticism, since the only reason we can care about the loss of species, languages and cultures is that they can die out; an immortal life is not grievable. Ecological relationality exposes all life to others and to a vulnerability before death, and species and non-human languages or semiotic systems will continue to live and die out long after we have gone (barring of course an apocalypse of such cataclysmic proportions that all life on earth would be immediately wiped out, but even cockroaches, tardigrades, fruit flies and scorpions have been said to be capable of surviving a nuclear war). But if death is so constitutive of life, why bother with sustainability? For the same reason that one tends to mourn less, or at least very differently, an elderly relative having lived a full and happy life than, I'd imagine, they would their four-year-old run over by a drunk driver in a gas-guzzling hummer. We have a profound sense of injustice faced with a death that comes before its time, occurring for nothing other than indirectly satisfying the desires of the world's wealthiest 1% more quickly and cost-effectively, at the cost of an incalculable number of living beings, languages, cultures, singularities, places and ecosystems. And while one may still certainly grieve the elderly relative in this hypothetical example, these deaths can also be sources of tremendous personal growth, an apprehension of one's own mortality and an appreciation for our time on earth with them, for what we inherit from them and pass on to others that, we hope, will be so lucky to live and die at their own rhythms.

General ecology is for me a manner of thinking life on earth by radically relating to this death as co-constitutive of survival and sustainability.[16] It is an epistemological, ontological and ethical framework that exposes any manner of being in the world – from the amoeba to the human in their relations to organic and inorganic matter – to untranslatability, non-knowledge, non-sense, interruption and impossibility. But these seemingly negative exposures do not

contradict the values of communication and relationality one might imagine as being more conducive to thinking ecology and sustainability. Rather, they make these relations possible in their affirmation not only of difference and diversity, but of processes of differentiation and diversification. To affirm biocultural diversity must thus in a sense renounce the attempt to control and master these processes and instead *let* them live-on, and ultimately die, in leaving them the time that is most proper to them. The *Others* in my title are not only other philosophers thinking about life and death, they are the incalculable singularities of every living being, every indigenous culture or minority language that must defend their time against that of global techno-capitalism, and whose time, as inappropriable as it may be, and perhaps precisely because of this inappropriability, we must give – or return – to them.

I include here brief summaries of the six chapters in this dissertation to give my reader an overview of its argument and hopefully facilitate its navigation.

One: Survivance and General Ecology. In this chapter, I argue that Derrida's thought of life in différance as survivance or life death allows us to think an ethics attuned both to the sustainability of organic life and species, as well as to the survival of minority languages, worldviews, texts and other forms of inorganic life. Through Georges Bataille's notion of general economy, I refigure the logic through which the living being structures and is structured by its environment to include epistemological, ontological, ethical, biopolitical and linguistic considerations. Derrida's notion of life in translation, I conclude, provides a way to think through the ethical aporias entailed in biocultural sustainability, and to think this latter notion by way of what he calls the promise of the earth.

Two: Transcendence and the Surviving Present. The argument of this chapter is that Edmund Husserl's concept of the Living Present, one at stake from the very beginning through to the very end of Derrida's philosophy, is an essential point of entry to understanding the deconstructive notion of life as living-on, in its structural transcendences or exteriorizations in time, alterity, death and matter. This 'trace-structure' of the Living Present operates at the level of organic life, just as it does in the inorganic structures through which the organism and its environment relate to one another, of particular importance here being linguistically, epistemologically, scientifically and historically. However, Derrida's reading of the Living Present, arguably by way of an encounter with Emmanuel Levinas, enjoins one to consider these structures beyond the sole purview of the human, and thus provides an important grounding for

thinking the aporetics of translation at stake in differentially sharing a world with its other living beings, along with the environmental ethics required to address these difficulties.

Three: Resistance and Ex-appropriation: Letting Life Live-on. This chapter attempts a radicalization of Martin Heidegger's concept of auto-affective transcendence as being-in-the-world in order to stage the ex-appropriation of its exclusive conferment upon the human. In doing so, I attempt to disclose a thought of the living in its arche-material remaining, restance but also resistance, anterior to the question of Being and to what Derrida calls ontological violence. In Derrida's deconstruction of Heidegger's ontology, I argue, the notions of *Gelassenheit* (releasement) and the *Zusage* (acquiescence) reveal not only the sharing of a radical passivity and vulnerability before death shared by all living beings, but also a thought of responsibility as letting beings be, indeed of ethics as letting life live-on, resisting the biopolitical, technoscientific and indeed linguistic objectification of beings complicit with environmental degradation.

Four: Animmanence: Life Death & the Passion and Perpetual Detour of Difference: In this chapter, I being by taking seriously Heidegger's argument that Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy has potentially destructive consequences for the earth, consequences that, I argue, are shared by many contemporary philosophies of immanence. However, I identify in Gilles Deleuze, Bataille, Maurice Blanchot and Derrida's readings of Nietzsche both a thought of the Will to Power as the passion of the Outside or of difference, as well as of the Eternal Return as the perpetual detour of difference. These readings, I argue, reveal a certain doubling in life death (where death is refigured both as inside and outside, personal and impersonal, possible and impossible), a powerlessness at the heart of the living, as well as the ex-appropriation of temporality necessary in thinking a selective affirmation of life, one more amenable to resisting the techno-biopolitical enframing of the earth and all its beings.

Five: Biopolitics and Double Affirmation: Step/nots Beyond an Ecology of the Commons: This chapter stakes its argument on distinguishing between an affirmative biopolitics that, I suggest, maintains important similarities to the ecological dangers highlighted in Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche, and a deconstruction of biopolitics by way of Derrida's notion of double affirmation. I argue that the reconceptualization of the living in its relation to death and its environment (scientifically, epistemologically, linguistically and politically) suggested in Michel Foucault's readings of Georges Cuvier, Xavier Bichat, Nietzsche, Bataille and Blanchot points to a more complex and, I argue, preferable framework in responding to these dangers. I illustrate

this by distinguishing two approaches to 'affirmative biopolitics,' that of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri which, I argue, remains at the level of a restricted ecology of power and resistance, of making and letting live and die, and that of Roberto Esposito which, particularly through his readings of Bataille and Blanchot, suggests a logic more akin to general ecology, one more in tune with letting life live-on and sharing the earth with its other living beings.

Six: Translation as a Material-Semiotic In(ter)vention: In this chapter, I suggest that the notion of the material-semiotic developed by Donna Haraway and Karen Barad allows one to jointly address important ethico-political aporetics shared by Science and Technology Studies, Ecolinguistics and Translation Studies. As I argue, non-representationalist accounts of words and things, as well as the organism-environment relationships developed in complementarity and systems theory allow for a thought of translation within which the ecologically destructive blind-spots of our own epistemological, ontological and linguistic frameworks may be addressed more directly. To think translation as both a necessary and impossible sharing of the world with its others allows us to articulate two concerns in ecolinguistics: the language of ecology (the recurring patterns through which languages differentially encode relationships to the environment) and the ecology of language (the 'ecological' relationships between languages) within what I call ecosystemic translation. This latter notion, I conclude, brings together the deconstructive, biopolitical and epistemological-ontological-ethical concerns of this dissertation towards the invention of other responses to biocultural sustainability. I conclude, in *In-conclusion*, with suggesting some avenues for possible further research and imagine certain novel articulations within which general ecology may find itself operating in the interest of biocultural sustainability in the future.

Each man is called upon to take up again the mission of Noah. He must become the intimate and pure ark of all things, the refuge in which they take shelter, where they are not content to be kept as they are, as they imagine themselves to be – narrow, outworn, so many traps for life – but are transformed, lose their form, lose themselves in the intimacy of their reserve, where they are as if preserved from themselves, untouched, intact, in the pure point of the undetermined. Yes, every man is Noah, but on closer inspection, he is Noah in a strange way, and his mission consists less in saving everything from the flood than, on the contrary, in plunging all things into a deeper flood where they disappear prematurely and radically. That, in fact, is what the human vocation amounts to. If it is necessary that everything visible become invisible, if this metamorphosis is the goal, our intervention is apparently quite superficial: the metamorphosis is accomplished perfectly of itself, for everything is perishable, for, says Rilke... 'the perishable is everywhere engulfed in a deep being.' What have we then to do, we who are the least durable, the most prompt to disappear? What have we to offer in this task of salvation? Precisely that: our promptness at disappearing, our aptitude for perishing, our fragility, our exhaustion, our gift for death.

Maurice Blanchot, *The Space of Literature*, 143-4/139.

Landscape without land, opened onto the absence of the fatherland, seascape, space without territory, without reserved path, without locality. Not that these are lacking but if it takes place, and *it must*, it will first have to open itself to a thought of the earth [*terre*] as the fraying of a path.

Jacques Derrida, *Parages*, 15/7*t*.

Deconstruction is when something *deconstructs itself*. All of a sudden, there is no longer any foundation, any certain axioms, even any assured terrain, *die Welt ist fort*, the world itself, the world as earth, as founding ground, is no longer assured. I think one only begins to think at the heart of this tremor. All of a sudden, there is no longer anything guaranteed, anything solid. But I'd say that this experience is always an experience of responsibility.

Jacques Derrida, "La Mélancolie d'Abraham," 48.

One: Survivance and General Ecology

In this chapter, I'll attempt to develop Derrida's notion of survivance or life death, along with rethinking his and Bataille's concept of general economy as general ecology, in order to stake out the theoretical grounds for thinking an ethics of sustainability towards living organisms, species, ecosystems and also languages, texts and cultures: an ethics of *biocultural* sustainability. These reflections, however, will no more attempt to vitalize inorganic processes such as languages than it will deploy life as a metaphor for thinking these. I intend to differentiate my approach from one grounded in the immanence, power and force of life, subtending what has been called the 'affirmative turn to life,' particularly in affirmative biopolitics.[1] I do this as much to circumnavigate the dark history of vitalism as to suggest that the mourning and compassion

for mortal life and finitude ultimately at stake in any thought of sustainability is better apprehended through a recognition of life in its passivity, powerlessness and originary contamination by death, as is the affirmation of life itself.[2] An ethics of sustainability oriented around this shared finitude will be concerned with the survival of species and languages as much for their own sake as for the interest of pluralizing the interruptive possibilities they pose to the dominant ethico-politico-juridical frameworks responsible for environmental degradation, let's call these subjective humanism and techno-capitalism. As suggested in my epigraph from Blanchot, the concern of such a sustainability will less be one of actively preserving its objects as self-identical than thinking the relations of differentiation, transcendence, impossibility and unknowability we share with them, along with the ethics of *letting* live-on these relations seem to demand.

The originarity of living-on suggests we are always already engaged in such a process. But deconstruction allows us to think both biological and cultural heredity and inheritance otherwise, allowing for a certain freedom in the selection and filtration of what one receives, epistemologically, ontologically and ethically, and the possibility of letting what one inherits live on otherwise and more justly, but indeed, and because of this freedom, also for the worse. Below, I will analyze living inheritance as caught in an unavoidable double bind in responsibility: both to the deployment of rules, norms and programs in thinking biocultural sustainability, and to what in life and death exceeds all calculation and programmability, unless the notion of the *pro-gramme* is itself rethought in its material inscription, beyond the classical oppositions of nature and culture, the human and its others, *physis* and *technè*, activity and passivity.

While I will be covering a variety of authors in this chapter, at times rather quickly, my intention is not to offer a comprehensive overview of their work, nor to offer anything to their particular scholarship. Rather, I wish to situate the contexts within which Derrida's notions of life, death, economy and ecology develop, and how I see these to contribute to the development of what I'm calling general ecology. These readings should be approached with this in mind. I begin in §1.1 by introducing Derrida's thought of life in *différance*, which I then illustrate through his readings of Freud and Jacob, revealing an originary technicity, alterity and relation to death at the heart of any living process. Through Derrida's work on Blanchot, I then develop this as a certain doubling at the heart of survivance and life death that opens onto the possibility of a

shared apprehension of this mortality. I proceed in §1.2 to examine Bataille's notion of impossibility in relation to his thought of economy and show, through Derrida's reading, the necessity of elaborating general economy as general ecology. In §1.3, I turn to the epistemological, ontological and ethical questions of how a living being structures its world and its others in Derrida's reading of Canguilhem. Against the dialectical, immanentist account proposed by the latter, I argue that Levinas's ethics better allows for the thought of transcendence required to maintain the unknowability and alterity of the other. I conclude in §1.4 by examining Benjamin's thought of translation as sur-vival, and its messianic promise of a reconciliation between languages. I then read Blanchot and Bataille's inquiries on community through Derrida's notion of the promise of the earth to imagine a promise of biocultural sustainability, and close in asking how one might inherit this promise justly.

§1.1: Survivance: Life and Death in Différance

§1.1.1: The Economy of Repetition and the Impossible: Freud and Jacob

This section will attempt to think together two important claims of Derrida's: that an originary dimension of survivance informs the entirety of his work, and that deconstruction is an experience of the impossible.[3] I will argue that there is a connection between Derrida's thoughts of life and the impossible that would be the key not only to understanding deconstruction itself but an appreciation of its epistemological, ontological and ethical stakes in thinking the life and death we share with others on earth. I'll attempt to develop this through an examination of life as an originary dimension of repetition, and show how Derrida's *différance* allows one to enter this into relation with what he calls the impossible. As he defines différance in *For What Tomorrow*,

> différ*a*nce means at once *the same* (the living being, only deferred, relayed, replaced by a substitutive supplement, by a prosthesis, by a supplementation in which 'technology' emerges) and *the other* (absolutely heterogeneous, radically different, irreducible and untranslatable, the aneconomic, the wholly other or death). The differantial interruption is both reinscribed into the economy of the same and opened to an excess of the wholly other. (DQ 74/40*t*)

General economy, I will show, is another name for différance since it allows us to think both *the same*, an economic delay and deferral, mechanical and machinelike repetition, also the mastery, sovereignty and reappropriative power over the stakes of this economy in its calculability (this is what I will call 'restricted' economy) and *the other*, an excessive and aneconomic expenditure

without reserve, death, the impossible, the unknowability and incalculability of the event, the wholly other and the promise.[4] This section and the next will not so much attempt to extend general economy to the ecological, but to show that, if survivance and life death are indeed originary, general economy has been general ecology all along.

Différance situates every identity as relationally constituted by a network of differences, both in temporal deferral and spatial difference. If difference is prior to identity, then one cannot postulate identity as an origin that would subsequently repeat or reiterate itself in its survival. One has the idea that repetition usually comes after some event as a translation follows an original. Différance by contrast situates repetition as originary; the origin begins *by* repeating and propagating itself without limit, engaging, Derrida writes, a general deconstruction of all philosophical oppositions.[5] This thoroughly complicates the purity of any putative origin, any complete self-presence to one's activity and any notion of essence. An identity that can only be repeated is originarily related to others in a differential field and thus subjected to conflict, particularly in its passive exposure to vulnerability, suffering and death. A dimension of passivity is thus present within originary repetition. To say that that this passivity is anterior to the opposition of activity and passivity is to extract it from a notion whereby it would still be the result of a choice; 'I could be active, but I'm not.' Rather, this passivity is constitutive, always operational and actualized, and not the converse of a will, choice or potentiality. This entails for Derrida a profound reconfiguration of our most deeply held anthropocentric beliefs. While the renewed interest in the vitality of matter, processes, objects and so on must also certainly be understood as a challenge to this anthropocentrism, much of their arguments rest on a very Spinozist line of inquiry: what can a body do? Derrida invites us to ask a different question: not to confer recognizability on nonhumans on the basis of some shared power or capacity, but rather to follow Jeremy Bentham in asking 'can they suffer?' To ask this question interrogates a shared passivity, passion and what he calls a non-power at the heart of power before death between all living beings, explaining that

> being able to suffer is no longer a power; it is a possibility without power, a possibility of the impossible. Mortality resides there, as the most radical means of thinking the finitude that we share with animals, the mortality that belongs to the very finitude of life, to the experience of compassion, to the possibility of sharing the possibility of this nonpower, the possibility of this nonpower, the possibility of this impossibility, the anguish of this vulnerability, and the vulnerability of anguish. (AS 49/28)

Anthropocentric thought for Derrida has always opposed a human freedom of active response to the mechanical reaction of other living beings. With originary repetition, one is called upon to think a certain mechanical reactivity at the heart of the human that not only casts doubt on the alleged being-ethical of any ethical decision or responsibility (such a doubt being in fact coextensive with ethics itself for Derrida) but allows ethics to take into account the vastly differentiated fields of experience within which all living beings structure and are structured by their environments. The distinction between active responsibility and passive reaction, and the entire history of ethical, political and juridical responsibility thus becomes reinscribed in a new thinking of the relations between life, the living, the mechanical, technology and death, beyond the opposition of nature and culture.[6] Originary repetition means that there is a machinic element of repetitiveness at the heart of any identity, since an identity can only be what it is by returning to itself, but this return originarily passes through the detour of the other. The identity it returns to is not the one it was, and this process of differentiation in repetition is always ongoing. What Derrida calls 'iterability' designates the element of alterity in repetition.[7] One is thus invited to think an originary technicity at the heart of the living organism: any living being, Derrida writes, "undoes the opposition between *physis* and *technè*. As a self-relation, as activity and reactivity, as differantial force, as repetition, life is always already inhabited by technicization." (NII 244) This technicization is the condition for anything at all to happen to a living being; a techno-biological prosthesis constitutes every organic synthesis. It is itself the condition of living together with others and, he adds, "it is death in life as the condition of life."[8] (DJ 62*t*) This death is not only that which the living being economically defers, postpones and evades but that which it draws upon as the very possibility of this deferral. In other words, life has as its economic condition of possibility its aneconomic condition of im-possibility, an im-possibility irreducible to the opposition of possibility and impossibility.

It is in Derrida's reading of Freud in "Freud and the Scene of Writing," that I will begin my analysis of what Derrida calls life death [*la vie la mort*].[9] Derrida's later treatment of Freud in "To Speculate: On 'Freud'" itself corresponds to the final four sessions of his 1974-5 seminar *La Vie la mort*, which also engages the work of biologist François Jacob's *Logic of Life* [La Logique du vivant] and Heidegger's critique of Nietzsche's alleged biologism in his *Nietzsche* lectures.[10] Derrida's point throughout is that all the oppositions developed by Freud, notably that between the life and death drives must be understood in terms of différance, or of an originary

repetition or detour at the heart of life. But this detour, I will show, opens onto an impossibly exterior alterity, irrecuperable within its economy, an element of non-knowledge as death, the wholly other and the anachrony of a time without present or presence. Differently from the classical concept of supplementation, within which something comes to economically supplement a self-present totality from the outside, whether to complete an internal lack or as an addition, Derrida's concept of supplementarity will consist in inscribing this beyond within. This will be the key, I will show, to thinking life death and survivance as relations with an exteriority beyond the opposition of possibility and impossibility.

For Freud, an organism's primary aim is to seek pleasure, but when this imprudently puts the organism in danger, a reality or conservation principle comes to defer the pleasure principle.[11] The difference between the two principles for Derrida constitutes the originary possibility of a detour and différance as the economic deferment of death within life, which protects itself by constituting a reserve to defer a dangerous investment.[12] But this self-protection of life does not posit a life that would *later* come to protect itself in repetition and différance. The very concept of a 'first time' yields to an originary dimension of repetition, "death at the origin of life which can defend itself against death only through an *economy* of death, through deferment, repetition, reserve." (ED 300-1/202) To think the originary repetition of life as différance is indeed to say that life *is* death, but even this *is* will find itself problematized in *life death*.[13] If life *is* death, it can only survive in its différance from itself. In "To Speculate...," the detour through the reality principle allows the pleasure principle to return to itself within the same economy, in the sovereign mastery of its detour, in order to reappropriate itself and the other within the proper circulation of its *oikos*.[14] However – and importantly not *opposed* to this economy, since as I will show, the logic of opposition would dialectically recuperate this process – Freud also postulates a death drive which would seem to exceed this economy of life. As Derrida asks in "Différance,"

> How are we to think *simultaneously*, on the one hand, *différance* as the economic detour that, in the element of the same, always aims at coming back to the pleasure or the presence that have been deferred by (conscious or unconscious) calculation, [this is what I would call restricted economy/ecology] and, on the other hand, *différance* as the relation to an impossible presence, an expenditure without reserve, as the irreparable loss of presence, the irreversible usage of energy, indeed, as the death drive, and as the relation to the wholly other apparently interrupting every economy? It is evident – and this is the evident itself – that the economical and the non-economical, the same and the wholly other, etc. cannot be thought *together*. (MP 20/19*t*)

Différance is this unthinkable relation between the mechanical repetition of a restricted economy and the impossible, the wholly other and death. With respect to general ecology, it will be important to see how différance inscribes the living within the transcendence of a material space, an Outside originarily beyond the restricted and circular detour of its immanence, whether, to paraphrase Derrida, one calls this space the earth or the world of life death.[15] It's therefore essential to show how Derrida's thought of death goes beyond that he reads in Freud, for whom even the aneconomy of the death drive becomes reappropriated within an economy. While the death drive pushes the organism to return to an anterior state of inanimate and inorganic matter, indeed to 'nature,' the conservation drive protects it from any external forces that would disrupt the immanence of its return-to-self. Life itself is inscribed in this differantial relay with the transcendence of nature or the material world, which Derrida calls "the 'external' force which disrupts the immanent tendency, and which in a way produces the entire history of a life which does nothing other than repeat itself and regress, … what is usually called nature, the system of the earth and the sun." (CP 377/354) For Derrida, that the organism seeks to die its own, proper death constitutes the law of *la-vie-la-mort* for Freud: the law of the proper, of restricted economy and ecology. Derrida writes:

> it is indeed a question of an *economy* of death, of a law of the proper (*oikos, oikonomia*) which governs the detour and indefatigably seeks the proper event, its own, proper propriation (*Ereignis*) rather than life *and* death, life *or* death. The prolongation or abbreviation of the detour would be in the service of this properly economic *or ecological law of oneself as proper,* of the auto-mobile auto-affection of the *fort:da*. (CP 381-2/359*e*)

To anticipate the stakes of my next two chapters, Derrida suggests that (what I may be beginning to be justified in calling) the restricted ecology of the living, reappropriating every material transcendence within the immanence of its own detour, ought to be thought together with the temporalizations discussed by Husserl and Heidegger.[16] Derrida will allow me to productively complicate the relation between the organism and its outside, environment, others, space, time and ecology in relation to phenomenology and ontology more broadly in chapters 2 and 3.

To further differentiate Derrida's thought of life death on these questions, allow me to examine his engagement of Jacob in *La Vie la mort*.[17] As Derrida explains, Jacob attempts to distinguish 'the living being' (*le vivant*) or the organism as the proper object of biology from the metaphysical concept of Life that has preoccupied the debates between vitalism and materialism,

teleology and mechanism: a metaphysical essence immanent to the living being.[18] Derrida seems sympathetic to this move, but faults Jacob for immediately himself deciding on an essence of life, indeed Hegel's, to flesh this out: *the capacity of life to re-produce itself*. Reproduction moreover constitutes a quite Aristotelian concept of causality in Jacob's logic of the living, where a cause *x* always explains its reproduced effect *y* from within.[19] Jacob in fact rediscovers there the essentiality of essence in this definition, not only the essence of its being (*ousia*) and cause (*aitia*) but also its essence as *energeia*.[20] All classical theories of essence ensure the possession of one's principle of being, one's production and reproduction, *from within*, and not as an accident from outside. Although I can't show this in detail here, arguably the major theories of being and life in Western thought (Derrida lists here Aristotle, Hegel, Spinoza's *conatus* and Leibniz's *appetitus*) postulate production and reproduction thusly. Rather than uncritically lumping all these definitions together, Derrida intends here to demonstrate a powerful code at work in each, particularly as concerns the question of death and its exteriority. As the essence of life is the capacity to reproduce itself, the bacterium (and Derrida will eventually gloss this across the entire field of the living) does not experience death or sexuality in an 'essential' sense for Jacob; both the death drive and *eros*, to paraphrase Freud's dualism of instinctual life, arrive as a classical supplementation from the outside. The 'death' thus resulting would be its simple disappearance, along with the exhaustion of its reproductive capacity.[21] The bacterium would simply receive a contingent death from its environment, or its culture as Jacob puts it, and not death in the proper sense. The only death worthy of the name "is a death that does not limit itself to a non-life, a death that is not contingent... 'coming from the outside,' affecting from the outside." (L5, 14-5*t*) The non-life that the bacterium encounters from the outside is a non-death; it never encounters real death and therefore, recalling the connection between economy, propriety, mastery and power, "this life is *invulnerable*, a *pure life* inaccessible to the slightest negativity. Death does not meet it, it passes over it as its outside." (L5, 15*t*) The proper, non-external, non-exterior, non-transcendent death must rather "be regulated by an internal law of being, essence, reproducibility, therefore of life, livingness, it must not have the status of an addition or a supplement." (L5, 16*t*) One thus has in Freud and Jacob a split between on the one hand a proper, immanent death and a non-proper, transcendent death, but only the former being of any importance. I'll discuss this doubling of death in the next subsection.

If différance is the counterpoint to any notion of identity as given, however, one cannot think life as essence. Accordingly, the structure of originary repetition precisely forbids Derrida from proposing différance as the essence of life, "as différance is not an essence, as it is not anything, it *is* not life, if Being is determined as *ousia*, presence, essence/existence, substance, or subject." (ED 302/255) The deconstruction of supplementarity entails that anything any economy would want to keep out from the propriety of the human or life comes to originarily contaminate it from within, whether this is its relation to other living beings (human or otherwise), the inorganic, death or the techno-machinic. Originary technicity expropriates the proper from both the human and life itself, and death is also this material, indeed technological supplement, "*technè* as the relation between life and death."[22] (ED 337/287) Against the notion of life as something within the organism, to think life in différance is to think it in its technical iterability, its vulnerable exposure to death. As Derrida writes almost 40 years later, this machinality alone assures sur-vival, beyond any opposition between life and death. "That's also finitude, the chance and the threat of finitude, this alliance of the dead and the living. I shall say that this finitude is *survivance*." (BS2 193/130)

In his definition of life as the capacity to re-produce itself, Jacob distinguishes on the one hand between the living organism, capable of *re-producing* itself, and the machine, capable only of *production*. However, reproduction is never for Derrida simply the effect of an already existing being.[23] The auto-reproduction of the living being is not that of an ego, consciousness or a self-identical and self-same identity; the living being is its own reproducibility, but this reproducibility must be thought in its originary contamination with the inorganic. The opposition between the organic and the inorganic, reproduction and production would itself be derivative with respect to différance. Just as the machine can only produce in receiving energy from its outside, for example by way of human use, the living being depends on its structural outside for its reproduction in taking in food, energy and matter.[24] Any self-relation in re-production must thus already be understood in its différance-from-itself, in its relation to the other and the outside, and this "just as much in the living as in the non-living." (L6, 17*t*) As against the classical logic of supplementarity within which Jacob reads death and sexuality, *thanatos* and *eros*,

> these two 'inventions' arising from outside, quasi-accidentally, consist in placing inside, in inscribing as an internal law the very thing that comes from outside. What the supplement brings from outside is an internal supplement, such that all the oppositions

> that Jacob confidently operates (necessary/contingent, internal/external, organism/environment, etc.) and consequently non-sexuality/sexuality, life/non-life fall apart. (L5, 16*t*)

As I will show throughout these chapters, no process intending to appropriate or reappropriate the transcendences of alterity, materiality, time or death within the economy or ecology of its immanence can ever be assured of the permanence or completeness of this attempt. In the law of the *oikos*, Derrida writes, "in the guarding of the proper, beyond the opposition life/death, its privilege is also its *vulnerability*, one can even say its essential *impropriety*, the expropriation (*Enteignis*) which constitutes it."[25] (CP 382/359*e*) But one can also read this logic as fundamentally structuring the anthropocentric presuppositions deconstructing themselves here, along with the propriety of the *oikos* of any restricted economy or *ecology*.[26] Any rigid distinction between inside and outside, life and death, is exceeded in this structural openness, and along with it any possibility of calculating or fully mastering life in différance. To think the living in its originary repetition, arche-technicity and machinality and the exteriority these inscribe within it opens onto nothing less than the experience of the impossible, the incalculable and what Derrida calls the event. This dimension of incalculability instils a dimension of freedom, but also a responsibility overflowing the opposition between machinic production and organic re-production, reaction and response, activity and passivity. And here, Derrida writes, one must still distinguish between on the one hand a (restricted) incalculable that still belongs to the order of calculation and the subject, and a non-calculable that would exceed this order. "The event – which in essence should remain unforeseeable and therefore not programmable – would be that which exceeds the machine. What it would be necessary to try to think, and this is extremely difficult, is the event *with* the machine." (DQ 86-7) General ecology will allow us to think this 'monstrous' necessity and impossibility of the event-machine, *necessary* machinic repetition and *impossible* organic spontaneity, but not without its doubling into death.[27]

§1.1.2: Doublings of Life Death: Blanchot

Let me recall that my stakes in §1.1 entailed thinking together two remarks of Derrida's as the grounds for a more compassionate thought of ecological relationality: that deconstruction is an experience of the impossible and that an originary dimension of survivance informs the entirety of his work. Survivance owes a far greater debt to Blanchot than is usually acknowledged, and

while I cannot engage the latter's work in much detail here, I wish to flag how his reflections on the experience of the impossible, the Outside, vulnerability, passivity and a non-power at the heart of power in the relation to death structure for Derrida both an affirmative thought of life and a shared compassion with other living beings in an (ultimately *ethical*) co-passion before suffering and death. In his recent *Inanimation*, David Wills outlines two possible contaminations between life and death; an enlivening of the inanimate or a vitalization of matter, and an originary technicity or inorganicity of the living he follows Derrida in calling lifedeath. The former notion is ascribed by Wills to Deleuze and Guattari, and also has its adherents in Foucault's readings of Bichat and Cuvier. I'd argue it is also visible in affirmative biopolitics, the 'affirmative turn to life' and certain forms of new materialism, new vitalism and process philosophy. For Wills, both trends are really two sides of the same coin, and both are affirmative philosophies of life.[28] I follow Wills in preferring life death, but feel the need to add that I see any vitalization of matter or the inorganic as an effect of life death, finding the sole possibility of its dialectical coinage in the aneconomy of Blanchot's double death, which I'll show also structures Deleuze, Foucault and Esposito's accounts of life in chapters 4 and 5.

As Derrida points out in his final interview, the idea of survivance as a complication of life death occurs in its earliest form in "Pas," where he cites Blanchot's *The Work of Fire* (1949) on a "survival which is not a survival/one [*survie qui n'en est pas une*]," but does not include the next phrase, "a death that does not put an end to anything."[29] (BPF 327/340*t*) This death that is impossible to die, I argue, can be read as the *doubling* implied by a 'survival that is not *one*.' In his final interview, Derrida brings up a similar doubling highlighted by Benjamin's "The Task of the Translator," *überleben*, something rising above life, a post-mortem life surviving death, and *fortleben*, living on, prolonging life and continuing to live.[30] In this section, I'll discuss a notion of double death: on the one hand that which life can individually or personally delay, defer and postpone, and on the other an im-possible death that is impersonal in that it cannot be personally died, although it structures the possibility of its economic delay and deferral. Survivance or life death are structured in this doubling of death; the living being *must* economically appropriate and make its own a death that it ultimately *cannot*, and the living being precisely *is* this trying, until it no longer can, and no longer is.

Derrida highlights a contamination and equivocity at stake in any discourse of life or death that issues from what he calls an originary, structural dimension of surviving, irreducible to

their opposition. In his "Living-On: Borderlines," he proposes that one reads the title of Shelley's *The Triumph of Life* both as the triumph of life over death and as the triumph of death over life. Similarly, Blanchot's *L'Arrêt de mort* [Death Sentence] can be heard both as a death sentence and as that which arrests death. The *sur-* of survival itself oscillates between a thought of something that is still life and something more and better than life. It engages the undecidability of what Derrida calls a *'plus-de-vie,'* both more-than-life and no-more-life, one with which one is never finished. "Surviving overruns both living and dying, supplementing each with a sudden surge and reprieve, deciding [*arrêtant*] life and death at once." (P 153/134) Despite appearances, survivance is not above life, neither in the sense of a beyond nor in the sense of some superiority, sovereignty or power of life.[31] It can never be determined, finally, if the unconditional affirmation of life triumphs over death, or is merely a phase in what he calls the work of mourning.[32] Survivance is bound to an originary condition of mourning. Every surviving is one in reprieve, and one does not survive without mourning those they survive, a mourning that does not even await an actual, I'd say even a possible death.[33]

Death thus makes possible any affirmation of life, since life cannot affirm its continuation without deferring death. The possibility of the affirmation of life is the impossibility of life's indefinite survival, its radical finitude both as something it surmounts and defers and as something impersonal, anonymous and impossible that tarries along beside it as its structural condition of possibility. Conversely, as Derrida puts it in *Sur Parole*, survival is also the ineluctable structuring dimension of any death, both of death itself and of any anticipation, awaiting of or anxiety before death. Survivance thus conditions a dual movement, "an attention to the imminence of death at every moment that is not necessarily sad, negative or morbid [*mortifière*], but on the contrary... life itself, the greatest intensity of life." (SP 52*t*) My intention here then is less to offer a gloomy rejoinder to the affirmative turn to life in contemporary thought than to provide a critical reflection on the conditions of possibility and impossibility of such affirmations in order to think sharing life death on earth with its others more justly.

Death for Blanchot puts an end to nothing because death is impossible to die, and not only because it is impossible for a living being to experience its death in the present. Death must thus be thought otherwise than as a power or as an internal possibility for some subject or ego. To say that death is impossible for Derrida is precisely not a jubilant victory over death, but rather an acquiescence limiting all power, returning all power, mastery and possibility towards

an unpower and impossibility.[34] Blanchot also borrows the notion of an experience of the impossible – which I mentioned would later lend its name to deconstruction itself – from Bataille. As he puts it, one must understand for Bataille that "possibility is not the sole dimension of our existence, and that it is perhaps given to us to 'live' each of the events that is ours by way of a double relation." (BEI 307/207) On the one hand, to (restrictedly) live each event in terms of what can be mastered, grasped and related to some value, and on the other as the inescapable trial of an impossibility without use or end, a non-power subtending everything we experience, live, think or say.[35] In the experience of the impossible, the impossible is not the negative reversal of the possible but an excessive affirmation beyond its power.[36] The affirmation of the impossible is itself a nonpower since it affirms more than can possibly be affirmed, it is a passion irreducible to modifications of power, appropriation and activity: "the passion of the Outside itself." (BEI 65/46) Any affirmation of life is doubled since it must affirm both its restricted possibility (the death it survives) and its aneconomic im-possibility (the one it cannot) as co-constitutive possibilities of its living-on.

For Blanchot, philosophy will have always operated in the movement of a '*grand refus*' against the Outside and death. Hegel, I will show in the next section, makes of death a pure negation through which life can be reborn as the life of Spirit. Derrida calls this the '*phoenix motif*,' reborn from its ashes.[37] Heidegger, for his part, attempts to make of death a power; death is my ownmost possibility, no one can die in my place, the power to die authentically is precisely what separates the human Dasein from all other living things.[38] Dialectics and ontology both think death as possibility, as power and reappropriation, and I showed a similar logic operating in Freud's account of the death drive for Derrida. However, Blanchot imagines a double death in *The Space of Literature*,

> one which circulates in the language of possibility, of liberty, which has for its furthest horizon the freedom to die and the capacity to take mortal risks [it is this limited risk, I will show below, that is at stake for Bataille in distinguishing his thought from restricted economy] – and there is its double, which is ungraspable. It is what I cannot grasp, what is not linked to *me* by any relation of any sort. It is that which never comes and toward which I do not direct myself. (BEL 104/103)

The dialectics, ontology and speculative psychoanalysis that would name death as a personal project for Blanchot find consolation before the anonymity of a 'One dies' [*On meurt*]. It is this impersonal, anonymous death that doubles the restricted economy of a death grounded in

possibility, it is the Outside preventing, preceding and dissolving any personal relation.[39] The Outside is precisely not a death that would come from the exterior to supervene upon a self-present life. Impersonal death is for Blanchot something other than the worldly reality of my death; it is the inevitable but inaccessible abyss of a time without present within which "*I* do not die, I have fallen from the power to die. In it *one* dies; one does not cease, and one does not finish dying." (BEL 160/154*t*)

By extracting death from its relation to power and the possible, for the reasons outlined above, one is thus better able to think the vulnerability we share with all living beings and its relevance in an ethics of ecological relationality. In the thought of the impossible, I mentioned, death announces itself along an-other modality than that of power, what Derrida would later echo from Blanchot as "*this non-power that would not be the simple limitation of power*." (BEI 62/44*t*) As for Derrida, the experience of this non-power lies in the suffering we share with nonhuman living beings, and is thus the grounds of a compassion in co-passion.[40] Like death, this non-power is itself the condition of an affirmation of life. However, one must be careful to distinguish Blanchot and Derrida's thought of affirmation here as proceeding from one which has gone through the trial and suffering of an experience of death only to dialectically overcome and supersede this death in the Hegelian *Aufhebung*, as I will show in §1.2. This affirmation must be understood beyond all dialectical negation, since the experience of the impossible is never overcome. Because impersonal death is impossible to die, its affirmation can only be excessive, beyond its own power.[41]

In *Demeure: Fiction and Testimony*, Derrida pursues this notion of the passivity of a passion anterior to the opposition of activity and passivity, without mastery, subjective activity or essence. Passion "implies the endurance of an indeterminate or undecidable limit where something, some X... must bear and tolerate everything, *suffer everything precisely because it is not itself*, because it has no essence but only functions." (DB 28/28) The impossibility of crossing this threshold operates along the logic of the *pas au-delà*, the step/not beyond that will prove immensely important below. Death is in this case the *necessary impossible*, with no *and* or *but* between these: the experience of the impossible, what Blanchot calls an "unexperienced experience."[42] (DB 57/47) In suffering, Blanchot writes, "we are delivered over to another time – to time as other, as absence and neutrality."[43] (BEI 63/44) This absence at the heart of time (which I will later call the disjunction at the heart of the Living Present) is precisely what

Derrida will identify as the condition of possibility of justice as, I believe, a co-passion within the non-power of mortal finitude. Death is always futurally imminent but its imminence always already carries life away from an immemorial past that has never been present, from a future to-come that cannot be anticipated or calculated. While the death drive finds consolation in referring death to the propriety of a present, death for Blanchot does not take place within the temporality of time. There are three certitudes in life: "a death that is always imminent, an impossible death, and the death that has already happened." (CU 328/n.a.) A double death, both inside, possible and calculable, and outside, im-possible and incalculable relates to itself across what I will soon call the differantial economy of a double bind, and structures the survival of any living being.[44] Every living being shares this impossible relation to death.[45] But what remains in the impossibility of dying is anything but the immortal permanence of eternity or plenitude. Derrida rather points to a non-philosophical and non-religious experience of immortality *as death*, a passion of death, as he borrows from Bataille, a passion of difference and a compassion in suffering. This immortal death, in its infinite finitude, to recall an expression concerning différance,

> gives compassion for all mortals, for all humans who suffer; and the happiness, this time, of not being immortal – or eternal. At this instant there can only be elation, lightness in the immortality of death, happiness in compassion, a sharing of finitude, friendship with finite beings, in the happiness of not being immortal – or eternal.[46] (DB 89/69)

The lightness and gaiety of the affirmation of life in survivance, I noted, cannot occur without the bereaved apprehension of death. Death is the very condition of a social bond in a compassion for mortal finitude, a passion for death, Derrida writes, a bond *without* bond one might call a relationality *without* relationality, binding *in unbinding* on the condition of death and mortal being.[47] Any affirmation of life must be committed to both the restricted economy of death it defers and the aneconomic excess of death that makes this deferral possible. The deconstructive logic of this double bind will be shown in §1.4 to structure all community and indeed all ecology. Far from being gloomy, the co-affirmation of life in this bond is "the affirmation of a living being who prefers living and thus surviving to death, because survival is not simply that which remains but the most intense life possible." (AVE 55/52) Similarly, as Derrida writes in his eulogy to Blanchot, what passes by way of a constant attention to death in the latter's work solely issues from an affirmation of life and living, and the singular gaiety and affirmation of the 'yes.'[48]

§1.2: From General Economy to General Ecology

§1.2.1: Bataille's Ecology of the Impossible

Bataille's concept of experience is another often unacknowledged but profound influence operating in Derrida's understanding of deconstruction as an experience of the impossible. Again, my primary concern here is not to propose a thorough reading of Bataille's works but to mark the salient points therein with respect to impossibility and economy both for Derrida and my development of general ecology. In *Inner Experience*, Bataille wishes to distinguish experience from any sort of project, action or any science whose values would rest on the known and the possible. Experience for Bataille is "a voyage to the end of the possible of man," one which in a quite Nietzschean sense negates all other value and authority to become authority itself.[49] (OC5 19/i 7) Here, however, Bataille recalls a conversation with Blanchot in clarifying this concept: "experience itself is authority (but that authority expiates itself)," its authority is nothing but a contestation.[50] (OC5 19/i 7) This is how one ought to understand Bataille's concept of sovereignty, perhaps more as the expi*r*ation of sovereignty; at the extremity of the possible, as he puts it in *Method of Meditation*, "the sovereign operation, *whose authority results only from itself – expiates this authority at the same time*." (OC5 223/u 98) Sovereignty is thus precisely the experience of the impossible for Bataille, and must be understood completely otherwise than the restricted economy of sovereignty Derrida targets in *The Beast and the Sovereign*, for example.

Experience for Bataille consists in rendering everything suspect, in questioning everything, and is coextensive with a certain pain and suffering. The desire to avoid this suffering can be read alongside the oceanic dissolution of the death drive, "*anyone wanting slyly to avoid suffering identifies with the entirety of the universe, judges each thing as if he were it. In the same way, he imagines, at bottom, that he will never die*." (OC5 10/i xxxii) All of humanity is caught in a struggle wanting to be everything and relate everything to the knowable and possible, but it can only do this in dying. Conversely, experience consists in renouncing this desire to be everything; it not only questions everything but *relates* everything to a non-knowledge and impossibility. Bataille's move here is quite deconstructive, playing out an analogous structure to what I will show as the 'beyond within' in Derrida.[51] While inner experience is said to be the contrary of action and the project, Bataille aphoristically proposes the principle of experience as an exit from the domain of the project *through* a project.[52] With

respect to Hegel, it consists in miming absolute knowledge and its circularity to open not unto an unknown that would then be dialectically reappropriated into the known, but onto something unknow*able*. In this exit, as he puts it, "I go through the bitter test of the *impossible*. All profound life is heavy with the *impossible*." (OC5 73/i 58*t*)

Hegel's dialectic can be understood as two circular movements for Bataille: the accomplishment of self-consciousness in the human *ipse*, and its becoming everything, the whole, its negation of human particularity within absolute knowledge. In and because of its self-enclosure in autonomy, the human wants to become the whole. However, the Being of ipseity is really nowhere, just as the by-definition indivisible atom is composed of subatomic particles. While certain animals such as the sponge or the siphonophore survive their division into smaller pieces or their aggregation into colonies, 'linear' or non-colonial animals lose this ability to compose a larger single animal in being grouped together. But while bees and humans have autonomous bodies and come together in societies, Bataille is not convinced that these are autonomous beings. The thought a human as a self-identical entity is a fiction; the elements composing us incessantly die off such that we are not comprised of the same elements we once were after a few years.[53] A living being is never simple, but always externally constituted by relations and worked through by an internal division. What you are, Bataille writes, is

> the activity which links the innumerable elements which constitute you to the intense communication of these elements among themselves. These are contagions of energy, of movement, of warmth, or transfers of elements, which internally constitute the life of your organic being. Life is never situated at a particular point: it passes rapidly from one point to another (or from multiple points to other points), like a current or like a sort of streaming of electricity (...) Further on, your life is not limited to that ungraspable inner streaming; it streams to the outside as well and opens itself incessantly to what flows out or surges forth towards it. (OC5 111/i 94)

Life on this reading seems to dissolve ipseity both from within and without, extending beyond the limits of the organism. It bears a certain resemblance to Deleuze's reading of life in *The Logic of Sense* taken up by Esposito in *Bios* in expressing the dimension of the impersonal, a "free, anonymous, and nomadic singularity which traverses men as well as plants and animals independently of the matter of their individuation and the forms of their personality." (LS 131/107) Only by relating to others can a living being establish itself, but if this relationality were to become absolute, the living being would dissipate into nothingness. Life must restrict economy in response to this relationality in the detour of its return to self. And, like Deleuze and

Esposito's accounts, this relational life must be grounded in a thought of death in the experience of the impossible. The loss of knowledge and sense to which everything is exposed within experience must risk nothing less than death itself, this risk being the very condition of chance. The chance faced in the horror before death, however, is otherwise than that bound to the subjective will that would attempt to calculate its risk with certainty. Approaching death in this sense requires a double movement for Bataille, between action and loss, power and powerlessness. As he writes in *Guilty*, "in alteration, you have to act *first of all* (loss presupposes action and a previous charge), *then* lose." (OC5 338/g 93) In other words, in a restricted economy, the loss presupposing the calculative action of restitution must engage the expenditure without return. Our subjection to this excess is itself constitutive of our living activity; life must affirm both restriction and expenditure, and both are co-constitutive of the living being. In a Hegelian sense, the negativity that reappropriates death within the life of spirit is originarily related to negativity without use, the movement of growth, possibility and accumulation being a necessary condition to that of loss, impossibility and death, and the latter movement itself constitutive of the former.[54]

> General economy, as Bataille defines it in *Method of Meditation*, is a
>
> science relating objects of thought to sovereign moments... considering the meaning of these objects in relation to others, finally in relation to the loss of meaning... *General economy* makes evident in the first place that a surplus of energy is produced that, by definition, cannot be used. Excess energy can only be lost without the slightest goal, in consequence without any meaning. It is this useless, senseless loss that *is* sovereignty. (OC5 215-16/u 284)

General economy for me attempts to relate any system, whether epistemological, ontological or ethico-political to a loss of sense, an impossibility and an Outside for which the system cannot account. My reason for approaching general economy as general ecology is quite simple; I've shown how the economy of différance is often explained in terms of organic and even inorganic life and death. The economy of life death or survivance necessarily and originarily inscribes itself within matter and also 'nature' (albeit a 'nature' always in différance with itself).[55] As Derrida claims in *Positions*, everything he writes can be called materialist if such matter is designated as radical alterity, heterogeneity or the absolute outside. "Rigorously reinscribed within general economy (Bataille) and in double writing... the insistence on matter as the absolute outside of oppositions, the materialist insistence (in contact with what 'materialism' has

represented as a force of resistance in the history of philosophy) seems necessary to me."[56] (PE 89/66*t*) Derrida's acknowledgement of his interest in 'mechanistic materialism' might thus be thought alongside his 'materiality without matter.'[57] In *Dissemination*, one sees the same thought of matter as the absolute exteriority and Outside of philosophical concepts. On the one hand, in what one might call restricted ecology, life's repetition is tautological, only exiting itself to return to itself. General ecology thinks this repetition with another aiming towards a non-ideality, a non-Concept, an exit without return of life outside itself, the repetition of death, an expenditure without reserve and an irreducible excess.[58]

It is then not much of a stretch to read a notion of ecology into Bataille when he, in a section title of *The Accursed Share*, explains the sense of general economy as "*the dependence of economy with respect to the circulation of energy on the terrestrial globe*." (OC7 27/a 19) General economy goes beyond restricted economy in considering the general question of nature, the excess of energy for living matter on the earth.[59] The organism, whether plant or animal, is itself animated by a general movement of the 'exudation' and 'dilapidation' of living matter in the 'exhausting detours of exuberance' in eating, death and sexual reproduction, as one will recall from my discussions of Freud and Jacob. It is an elementary fact for Bataille that an organism receives more energy than is necessary to maintain itself alive, and if this excess of energy cannot be productively spent towards the organism's growth or possibilities, it must be unproductively wasted without any profit, lost, he writes, "like a river into the sea," (OC7 31/a 23) recalling a longer quote from *Inner Experience*: "life will lose itself in death, rivers into the sea, and the known into the unknown. Knowledge is access to the unknown. Non-sense is the outcome of every possible sense."[60] (OC5 119/i 101*t*)

This certainly brings together the 'ontological' stakes of life death and survivance with an epistemological question of knowledge, or a relation in the form of a non-relation, as Derrida puts it, with nonknowledge. The ecological-ethical stakes of this co-passion in mortality and unknowing will be developed in more detail in the next section, but Bataille has a few interesting ideas on this front as well. As early as *Inner Experience*, Bataille seems to mourn as a tragedy the fact than the human only lives in destroying, killing and absorbing plants, animals and other humans. The human exploitation of any appropriable resource is not limited to living organisms for Bataille but also its merciless exploitation of natural resources.[61] He thus hints at the strange rethinking of sustainability outlined in my epigraph from Blanchot since, as he puts it, the great

errors of humanity result from this disregard for the material conditions of its life.[62] General economy suggests an impossibly difficult ethics that, rather than preserving something or keeping something alive as self-identical through a process of calculation, *communicates* with it otherwise in the experience of the impossible.[63] What Bataille calls communication I could call translation since, I will show, this idea is intimately bound to the logic of survivance. Communication for Bataille is different than that between two beings, it communicates, he writes in *Guilty*, "through death, with a beyond of being... not with nothingness, even less with a supernatural entity, but with an indefinite reality (which I sometimes call *the impossible*, and that is: what cannot be *grasped* (*begreift*) in any way), what we cannot reach without dissolving ourselves." (OC5 388/g 139) This indefinite reality, however, is only indefinite insofar as it surpasses the humanly definable, it is not, he recalls, supernatural. It is in this sense of an otherwise than being, as an experience of the impossible, that I believe one must think the transcendence at work in survivance: as Derrida puts it, the inscription of a relation of transcendence, going beyond the world, within the presence, proximity and immanence of experience, the 'beyond within.'[64] General ecology then, may be what allows us to think this inscription in its materiality, in what I'll later explore as the general text of ecological relationality.

§1.2.2 From General to Strictural Ecology

In the *Positions* interview noted above, Derrida refers to general economy as a general strategy of deconstruction.[65] However, it is in his 1966 essay "From Restricted to General Economy: A Hegelian Without Reserve" that he develops this reading through Bataille's critique of Hegel's *Aufhebung*, a difficult word to translate meaning the dialectical sublation of differences. This concept (the Concept itself) comes to stand as the very definition of restricted economy, and "if there were a definition of différance, it would be precisely the limit, interruption, destruction of the Hegelian *relève* wherever it operates."[66] (PE 55/40-1) Restricted economy takes expenditure without reserve, death and the exposure to non-sense into account, but in an attempt to reappropriate them. General economy by contrast shows an excess over reappropriability, and relates these excesses to restricted economy. Derrida thus intends to enter into relation (*without relation*) both senses of différance: "a différance that can make a profit on its investment and a différance that misses its profit, the *investiture* of a presence that is pure and without loss here

being confused with absolute loss, with death." (MP 20-1/19) This move would consist in writing the *Aufhebung* otherwise; indeed, suggests the inscription of the Concept itself within the radical alterity of materiality.[67] General ecology, if I am now confident in using the term, designates the stricture of a double bind at the heart of life death and survivance, since any living-on must affirm both restricted economy and an expenditure without reserve, a risk of death beyond calculability.[68]

In Hegel's dialectic of mastery or lordship, the master must risk its life in a passage through death, a death which is thus negated, overcome, reappropriated, conserved and survived without remainder. The *Aufhebung*, Derrida writes in *Glas*,

> is the dying away, the amortization, of death. That is the concept of economy in general in speculative dialectics. Economy: the law of the family, of the family home, of possession. The economic act makes familiar, proper, one's own, intimate, private. The sense of property, of propriety, in general, is collected in the *oikeios*. The *Aufhebung*, the economic law of absolute reappropriation of the absolute loss, is a family concept. (G 187/133)

For Hegel, it is necessary for the master to keep the life he exposes to death. The *Aufhebung* restricts the economy of life to conservation, circulation and self-reproduction, mastering and conserving what it puts into play.[69] Bataille, one might say, critiques Hegel and the dialectic for proposing a restricted thought of life; "through a ruse of life... life has thus stayed alive. Another concept of life has been surreptitiously put in its place, to remain there, never to be exceeded." (ED 376/323) For Bataille, however, the risk of death, non-sense and impossibility must be absolute and without return. No one denies that life exists in its difference from death. However, the movement of différance as temporal deferral prevents this difference from stabilizing itself; death is thus always beyond the horizon of calculability, even though life must attempt to calculate its stakes.[70] In miming absolute knowledge, general economy engages *both* this absolute risk of death *and* the ruse or feint allowing this risk to be lived. In other words, it allows for a certain experience (the feint) of the impossible (the risk), but it is more precisely not an experience, since it is related only to the trial of the impossible, no more than it is 'interior' or related to a presence or plenitude; it is wholly exposed to the outside in the form of a non-relation. This non-logic of the impossible that transcends the logos *through* its very concepts, through the same words, is in a sense that of the beyond-within I mentioned above.

Transcendence, transgression, translation, all these movements I will show serve to interrupt economy for Derrida.[71]

As the impossible, sovereignty in Bataille's sense *is* nothing other than its loss. Its lightness and gaiety does not belong to the restricted economy of life, but rather constitutes the blind spot of Hegelianism, a death so irreversible and radical its negativity would exceed that of the *Aufhebung*, discovering the limit of discourse and the beyond of absolute knowledge.[72] I will have much to say about how general economy enters one into relation with the *blind* spot of a system, the impossible Outside of the visible dialectical, transcendental or ontological form, of the frame, violence, power and force.[73] Importantly, the sovereignty at play in general economy is not a counter-mastery, but both more and less than mastery as well as wholly other from it. It governs neither itself, others, things, discourses nor does it govern in general. It in fact corresponds more to powerlessness since it refuses the exercise of power.[74] General ecology thus relates any restricted ecological configuration, organic or inorganic, to a materiality, powerlessness, passivity, mortal finitude and impossibility (all of these may perhaps be non-synonymous substitutions of one another) that *resists* reappropriation into any *oikos*, whose exteriority is different from that which circles back towards interiority.

This resistance, remainder or what Derrida will call *restance* will be at play in every chapter to follow, resisting recovery into any metaphysical system, whether dialectical, transcendental, phenomenological or ontological. As an exteriority other than the opposition of interiority and exteriority, the remainder is bound to any restricted economy in what Derrida calls a stricture or striction.[75] While the striction allows the dialectical, transcendental or ontological to be thought, it "constrains the discourse to place the nontranscendental, the outside of the transcendental field, the excluded, in the structuring position. The matrix in question constitutes the excluded as transcendental of the transcendental." (G 340/244) The stricture thus corresponds to what Derrida calls here a 'contre-bande,' binding the transcendental, ontological and dialectical to their impossible Outside. With respect to my chapter on Husserl, the remainder cannot be thought as remaining from a past which would be a modification of presence, its remaining must be thought as an always already.[76] In anticipation of my chapter on Heidegger, the remainder can never co-respond to ontological questioning. Being is itself the dialectical *Aufhebung* for Derrida.[77] The materiality of this remainder also overflows the restricted economy of ideality and of the Concept that produces the *Aufhebung*, and Derrida draws a strong

connection between *eidos* (form) and *oikos* here.[78] I will discuss the dialectical 'Concept' and life in Canguilhem with respect to how the living being comes to know its world, and the ethico-political implications of form, *eidos* and visibility in my next section, implications I will also take up through Husserl, Heidegger, Levinas, Blanchot and Foucault throughout these pages.

The stricture of the double bind, however, insists that one cannot think a pure exit from the dialectical, transcendental or ontological towards a pure, transcendent beyond, since this would come down to a pure death, pure nothingness, would itself then find itself recuperated within a restricted economy. Derrida cautions against this in "To Speculate..." General economy is not simply an economy open to absolute expenditure, but is rather 'strictural,' designating a stricture between absolute expenditure and restricted economy.[79] The undecidability one reads in the *sur-* of survivance is also echoed in strictural economy. As Derrida puts it in *Glas*,

> this at-once constitutes an economy of the undecidable: not that the undecidable interrupts there the efficacy of the economic principle. The at-once puts itself in the service of a general economy whose field must then be opened. There is an economic *speculation* on the undecidable. This speculation is not dialectical, but it plays with the dialectical. (G 294/210)

One can see here Bataille's mimicry of absolute knowledge: the restricted economy corresponds to a '*feinte*,' a ruse that pretends to lose everything or to give itself death in order to cut death off, to arrest it. But, Derrida adds, "the feint does not cut it off. One loses on both sides, on both registers, in knowing how to play all sides [*sur les deux tableaux*] On this condition does the economy become general." (G 294/210) As he writes in "Living On," economy is a stricture, a bind and not a cut, arresting the authenticity, propriety and purity of any reappropriation of death. "It is always an *external* constraint that arrests a text in general, i.e. *anything*, for example life death... Think exteriority from the angle of this economy of the *arrêt*. *Arrêt*, the greatest 'bound' energy." (P 214/187)

Allow me to pursue these questions of survivance and life death to flesh out this stricture of the double bind in further detail. Any absolute exit out of the purity of self-present life would constitute a pure death, while the restricted economy of pure life itself is also pure death; both restricted economy and the expenditure without reserve taken on their own come down to death.[80] Pure life is pure death and pure death is pure death; this is why survivance is originary and what it means to lose on both fronts. The stricture of différance between, on the one hand, the restricted economy of life and death, inside and outside and all other such oppositions and, on

the other, the absolutely radical and impossible expenditure without reserve of death, this system of double death, as I showed in my reading of Derrida and Blanchot, is alone what gives both the chance and the threat for life to live-on and to affirm itself.[81] This stricture, inscribed within matter and 'nature' and differentially shared with all living beings, is what I am calling general ecology. Unlike dialectics, the *identity* of identity and difference, a *dialectics* of dialectics and antidialectics, the stricture binding general ecology must be understood as a *relation without relation*. The *without*, I will show in a moment, is what allows for a passive transgression of economy to open onto the wholly other, the unknowable and the impossible. More specifically, the *without* engages a life death that overflows the dialectical co-implication of these two terms.

In the first session of *La Vie la mort*, Derrida attempts to develop the sense of life death in relation to dialectical economy and what he calls the positional logic of juxtaposition or opposition. For Hegel, life itself is the position (*Setzung*) of the Idea posing itself through its three oppositions: the living individual, the processes of life and the species, and reappropriating its life in being reborn as the life of Spirit through its natural death. Derrida's hypothesis is that positional logic is perhaps itself a ruse or feint set forth by life death, the opposition or juxtaposition of life *and* death, life *or* death being *effects* or ruses of life death. His attempt here is not to *oppose* another logic to that of the opposition of life and death but rather to inquire into another alterity. But this other alterity would also not come down to saying that life *is* death; to do so would be precisely to repeat the logic of the *Aufhebung* whereby life risks death only to reappropriate it, "where death defines essence as the dialectical process of life keeping itself alive, as life, producing and reproducing itself." (L1, 6*t*) Both the logic of opposition, la vie *et* la mort, and the logic of identification, la vie *est* la mort, come down to one another. Both opposition and identification operate in the interest of life's reappropriation.[82]

Concepts, whether in science or in philosophy, and metaphors, particularly the biological metaphor which will prove important to my discussions of translation, would also be effects of life death, ruses "to dissimulate, keep, house, shelter or forget – something. What? A what in any case that would no longer *pose* or *oppose* itself and would no longer be something in this sense of the position." (L1, 2*t*) The stricture of life death produces dialectical *effects*, but does not itself know negativity or opposition, it rather engages the 'without' of the relation without relation.[83] This without, he writes in "Pas," operates without operating, "it lets return what has already been dissimulated as the wholly other and can only be dissimulated... The *without* auto-affects itself

by the wholly other (*without without without...*). It is then infinitely other with regard to the wholly other that affects or approaches [*aborde*] it." (P 92/79*t*)

Derrida expresses early on an intention to conclude *La Vie La mort* with Blanchot's *pas au-delà,* and although this text is never taken up, the intention to do so is recalled in "To Speculate..." where the step/not beyond opens onto precisely a relation without relation to the logic of the position.[84] The *pas* for Derrida is not a dialectical negation but an affirmative transgression, a negation of negation that does not come down to a double negation but rather marks an excess over any economic reserve.[85] It is in the *pas au-delà* that one can bring together the notions of the passivity I outlined above and the transgression of economy: as Derrida cites Blanchot, "*transgression transgresses by passion, patience, passivity*." (P 53/41) Transgression, for Blanchot, allows one to name transcendence beyond its theological sense, alluding to "what remains sacred both in the thought of the limit and in this demarcation, impossible to think, which would introduce the never and always accomplished crossing of the limit into every thought." (BPA 41/27) All movements in trans-, Derrida writes, violate the principle of equivalence within economy, expose all sense to a sliding, a '*pas de sens*' I will show, "and along with it everything that can insure a payment, a reimbursement, an amortization, an 'acquittal': coins, signs, and their *telos*, the adequation of the signified to the signifier." (CP 415/389) Most of all death: as Blanchot writes, "transgression: the inevitable accomplishment of what is *impossible* to accomplish – and this would be dying itself." (BPA 147/107) Derrida adds, "*trépas* [death: *trans* + *passus*]. *Trespassing*. To be related, without translation, to all the *trans-'s* that are at work here." (P 215/288)

This impossible logic being irresolvable, the double bind within what he now calls a 'bindinal economy' opens onto an infinite debt that can never be repaid, as impossible as Derrida's figures of the gift, promise and event.[86] "The gift, insofar as it exceeds economic exchange, must not have any sense." (FSC 65) All these figures, I could follow him in saying in *Given Time*, are related to economy as they aneconomically interrupt it, their exteriority sets the circle of economy in motion. But the impossibility of the gift, or promise, Derrida might add, does not mean that only the dead can give or promise. "No, only a 'life' can give, but a life in which this economy of death presents itself and lets itself be exceeded. Neither death nor immortal life can ever give anything, only a singular *surviving* [survivance] can give." (DT

132/102) Whatever peace or reconciliation is promised in the promise of the earth, the promise of ecology, finds in survivance its im-possible condition of possibility.

§1.3: How the Living Structures its World: Immanence and Transcendence

§1.3.1: Immanence: Concept, Metaphor and Norm in Canguilhem's Knowledge of Life

Having now elaborated the 'ontological' stakes of general ecology, I'd like to turn to its epistemological and ethico-political implications in more detail. I mentioned in §1.1 that most biological theories and philosophies of life from Aristotle to Jacob tend to think of reproduction as proceeding from the inside of an organism. The same is true, I'll illustrate here via Canguilhem, of how an organism structures its environment and its relations with others. For Canguilhem, an organism's ontology and its normativity stand in a relation of dialectical immanence to one another. While a threatened or diseased organism attempts to protect and conserve its life, a healthy organism realizes itself in the invention of new norms. In science and knowledge, this occurs through the dialectical overcoming of error. But what kinds of ethico-political consequences proceed from such an account of life? Canguilhem would prove immensely influential on Foucault and Esposito, and important biopolitical difficulties can be addressed by way of situating his arguments within the claims of general ecology. I'll examine these in much more detail in chapter 5, but for now wish to situate how general ecology breaks from this immanentism towards another ethics of life death on earth with its others.

In "The Concept and Life," Canguilhem begins by distinguishing two ways to understand the relation between these two terms: it can be understood as simply the way that organic life organizes matter, or it can refer to how the human comes to know life. This distinction is articulated upon that between *le vivant* (the living being), the 'form' and 'power' of life, and *le vécu* (lived experience), the former for Canguilhem grounding the latter. If the Concept has an apparently Hegelian ring, this is no accident; contemporary biology finds itself quite close to Aristotle and Hegel for Canguilhem.[87] Citing Hegel, "life is the *immediate unity* of the concept to its reality *without this concept being distinct from it*." (CE 345*t, e*) In the triple positional logic I showed Derrida reference above, "auto-conservation is the activity of the producing product. 'The only thing that is produced,' Hegel's *Propédeutique* claims, 'is what is already there.' An Aristotelian formulation if there ever was one." (CE 345*t*) The organism is itself what it seeks

and attains, and Life is thus totally immanent to the living, its beginning and end, producing and produced, singular and universal, and dialectical through and through.

If this coincidence between the Concept and life is so immediate, Canguilhem asks, how is it that science comes to know life by way of concepts? Thought and knowledge must espouse the dialectical structure of life, and a dialectical interpretation of biological phenomena is justified by what in life resists its mechanization: its spontaneity and creation.[88] These aspects of life distinguish the proper, scientific Concept from the improper, non-scientific metaphor, the difference being the operational value of the Concept: the progress and development it offers to knowledge, a relation dialectically inscribed in life itself.[89] The Concept in life proceeds in the dissatisfaction of the sense it finds and moves forward seeking a greater quantity and variety of information. "Subjectivity is therefore only dissatisfaction. But that is perhaps life itself. Contemporary biology, read in a certain manner is, in some way, a philosophy of life." (CE 364) The Conceptual understanding of biological heredity as the communication of information, message or coding returns us to an Aristotelian and Hegelian relation between the concept and life since it admits a *logos* that is inscribed, conserved and transmitted within the living, a sense inscribed within matter. It recognizes an objective, material and no longer formal a priori to organic life that proceeds in the production, transmission and reception of information in a dual movement of conservation and novelty, producing mutations and at times monstrosities. As he adds, "if life has a sense, one must admit that there can be a loss of sense, a risk of an aberration or misdeal. But life surmounts its errors by other attempts, an error of life simply being an impasse." (CE 364*t*) While the possibility of error and monstrosity is very real, it in no way engages an absolute loss of sense or knowledge, and this would seem to be a direct consequence of the dialectical relation between the concept and life.

As Canguilhem puts it, vitalism simply consists in recognizing something original in the facts of vitality, such as when Bichat, for example, defines life as the sum of functions resisting death.[90] Vitalism is to have faith in life; it is more of a morality and a demand than it is a scientific methodology. Canguilhem is not inattentive to the reactionary and fascist appropriations of vitalism, but argues that a biological theory shares as much responsibility for fascism as a mathematical one does for capitalism.[91] But the dark history of vitalism looms large in Derrida's biopolitical thought, as it does in his reading of Heidegger's *Nietzsche* in the *La Vie la mort* seminar.[92] Unlike classical vitalism, the living organism for Canguilhem does not

constitute an exception to the physical laws of its environment; to recognize the originality of life means to "'*comprehend*' matter within life, and the sciences of matter – which is science itself – within the activity of the living." (CC 122/70) What contemporary physics recognizes as the immanence of observer and observed, measuring and measured agencies is not only an epistemological relation for Canguilhem; every living being ontologically coordinates their environment, and only *living* beings can do so. The proper of the organism is to build and compose its own environment according to its own internal rules and norms.[93]

Every living organism has its own proper vital norms that are *immanently* present to its functioning: "presented without being represented, acting with neither deliberation nor calculation. Here there is no divergence [*écart*], no distance, no delay between rule and regulation."[94] (CN 186/250) The norms of the living organism are lived without any problems for Canguilhem.[95] In understanding the relation between the organism and the environment as a biological fact, one sees the environment not as a physical fact within which the organism is thrown, but one it structures and adapts through its own 'normativity,' defined as "the biological capacity to challenge the usual norms in case of critical situations." (CN 215/284) In this sense, the conservation instinct is not the general law of the living but rather that of the threatened or diseased organism; it depicts an organism in a state of struggle, dominated by *external* forces. By contrast, the healthy organism's interest consists in realizing its immanent nature.[96] Health is a feeling of more than normalcy, not just that of an organism adapted to its environment, but in a norm*ative* state, capable of following and inventing new norms of life.[97] I think there's something quite beautiful in this thought; a Nietzscheanism of which one can certainly see echoes in Deleuze, distinguishing between reactive and active forces.[98] Derrida notes that Nietzsche himself draws from the biology of his time in *The Will to Power* in arguing that health and disease are not essentially different.[99]

For Derrida, however, Canguilhem's account of life as communication, information and writing remains bound to a humanist and teleological account of science. For my part, I'll show that this vitalist immanentism is not only insufficient for the ethics of general ecology, but maintains important conceptual overlaps with some of the darkest biopolitical paradigms in history, overlaps I will take up in more detail in chapters 4 and 5. Conversely, to understand the dialectical Concept as a mechanical effect of life death would force us to think the epistemological, ontological and ethico-political implications of immanence wholly otherwise.[100]

Of course, the invention of new norms of life occurs only in breaking with previous ones, in inheriting them and in translating them otherwise. Recusing any assured distinction between the human and its others on this front, I argue that these norms can be epistemological, ontological, ethical, juridical, political; indeed bio-political, scientific, linguistic, literary and aesthetic. Inscribing Canguilhem's understanding of how the organism structures its world within general ecology, I will argue in §1.3.2 that the interruption in the norm, Form or frame does not come from the immanent action of the organism; it comes from the transcendence of the wholly other before which the organism is infinitely passive. It thus also calls for another thought of *le vivant*, but interprets genetico-biological laws by way of différance. "At certain 'moments,' this différ*a*nce can interrupt these laws; at other moments, it can introduce the economy of a new configuration into the immanence of the living being." (DQ 73/40) The invention of the other, I will show in chapter 5, is precisely deconstruction as an experience of the impossible.[101] In this sense, I argue that general ecology finds its true ethical programme in the questions Derrida puts to Levinas (and of course the ways in which Derrida goes beyond Levinas's humanism).[102] The excess that life must affirm in its dialectical reappropriation of itself is refigured here as the infinite alterity and transcendence of the other, where every other (one) is every (bit) other, before and beyond its determination as human.

§1.3.2: Transcendence: Levinas and the Ethics of the Beyond-Within

As mentioned above, Derrida remains suspicious of a humanistic and logocentric teleology in both Jacob and Canguilhem's understanding of the 'program' or 'writing' of life, coming down to a quite classical 'philosophy of life' for the latter: one that understands the living being's life, its relations with others and the world and its epistemological frameworks as essentially proceeding from the immanence of the living being. This semiotics or graphics of life remains bound to the Platonic, Aristotelian and Hegelian logos, while Derrida wishes to problematize this writing of life otherwise. After recalling, in the *Life Death* seminar, his remark in *Of Grammatology* that the notions of non-phonetic writing and pro-gramme now extend to the most elementary processes of information in the living cell, Derrida adds that this is precisely not to reintroduce the logos and its semantics into the notion of the program, or to return to Aristotle, but rather to provoke the deconstruction of the entire logocentric machine.[103] Canguilhem's rigid distinction between the scientific objectivity of the Concept and the metaphor presupposes what

one might call a restricted economy of science; the Concept corresponds to notions of propriety, adequacy and proper knowledge. But in defining the Concept in terms of its practical and operational use for science, Canguilhem neglects the fact that both metaphors and concepts can provide just as much an obstacle to knowledge than they can contribute to the progress of science.[104] Again in a very Nietzschean sense, Derrida remarks, the distinction between the useful and the detrimental would be more accurately representative of science for Canguilhem. Both concept and metaphor are two sides of the same dialectical coin, economically referring back to one another.[105] But if both the Concept and the metaphor are effects of life death, the discovery of the living in terms of writing or programme is neither an epistemological break in science nor an illustration of its continuous teleology.[106] If metaphor and Concept are more indissociable than one thought, "one must perhaps, like life death, save or lose them at once, in one blow. It's impossible, of course." (L3, 24*t*)

What Derrida calls the general text breaks with the immanent teleology of the dialectical relation between the concept and life, since no epistemology or scientific objectivity occurs without a relation to an alterity, I'd say the transcendence of the other.

> It is because alterity is irreducible therein that there is nothing but text, it's because no term, no element is sufficient or even has an effect if it does not refer to the other and never to itself that there is text, and it's because the text-set cannot close in on itself that there is only text, and that the so-called 'general' text (an evidently dangerous and only polemical expression) is neither a set nor a totality: it can neither comprehend itself nor be comprehended [*il ne peut ni se comprendre ni être compris*]. But it can write and read itself, which is something else. (L6, 4*t*)

I'd noted in my first definition of différance that it involves an economic and an aneconomic movement, the latter corresponding to an absolute heterogeneity, radical difference and the wholly other, just as iterability always involves a difference within every repetition. Iterability and différance thus also involve, I will show through Derrida's readings of Levinas in this section, the ethical inscription of the transcendence of the other within any relation of immanence. This alterity at the heart of epistemology and any organic relation to its environment seems perhaps a roundabout way to introduce Derrida's adoption of Levinasian ethics. But let me retain from these discussions the dialectical Concept and the notion of Form. This double bind I just spoke of, as Derrida writes in "Form and Fashion," would constitute an inexorable fatality at the heart of all language, including that of science and philosophy. It would, however, command one to *know* how to choose, but without assured knowledge, norm or any other means

of calculation, rather, this decision would be delivered to the Nietzschean 'perhaps,' to the incalculable, infinite transcendence of the other.[107] As Derrida adapts Alain David's difficult thesis, the philosophical notion of Form, one that would have survived through Husserl's transcendental phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology, would strangely be the unique source of racism and anti-Semitism, and one could add sexism, homophobia, transphobia here, and specifically for my purposes anthropocentrism: "*form* itself, the fascination for the form, that is to say for the *visibility* of a certain organic or organizing contour, an *eidos*, if you will, and therefore an idealization, an *idealism* even as it institutes philosophy itself, philosophy or metaphysics as such."[108] (FF 10*t*) To delimit by giving form or by believing to see a form would be the source of the worst oppressions, the worst itself, the monstrosities of genocides, slavery and ecological destruction. But it would also produce a monstrosity that defies the norm and deforms the form.[109] Along with Canguilhem's discussions of monstrosity, let me recall that Derrida's figure of the event-machine, both organic spontaneity and mechanical iterability, would itself bear some monstrosity in its im-possibility.[110] In the double bind between these two monstrosities, the worst and the best, the question becomes an epistemological-ontological-ethical one of *knowing* how to choose, of selectively filtering what one inherits.

Derrida distinguishes two responses to this enframing by form.[111] The first would be that of a material phenomenology such as proposed by Michel Henry, one I think bears much resemblance to Canguilhem's. Derrida, however, expresses some serious reservations before what he calls a transcendental vitalism and its emphases on "pure 'transcendental life,' absolute immanence, (...) the pure life of the 'living,' (...) the immanence of 'feeling oneself alive,'" noting its grave political complicities and dark historical connotations. (FF 16-17*t*) The other response is that of an interruptive transcendence inspired by Levinas, which would discover the underside of Concepts, the latter bearing a direct connection to Form. To go to the underside or the beyond of the concept would discover "the transcendence of the other that the concept, as it traditionally gives itself to science and philosophy, tends to fix within the objectivity of a *form*." (FF 12*t*) It's essential, I believe, to think of this underside in terms of the beyond, but also in the interruptive transcendence and transgression of the *pas au-delà* and the beyond-within I mentioned above, since these intersect with what Derrida calls "the concept (without concept) of the Im-possible, and especially of the unlimited affirmation of the Im-possible." (FF 20*t*) This affirmation, which is itself already a response to the other, one of an infinite responsibility, is

certainly Levinasian.[112] But it is also necessary to engage this affirmation in a thought of the Im-possible, perhaps more distant from Levinas's work and closer to Heidegger and Bataille.[113] If deconstruction is an experience of the impossible, what is impossible "is to inscribe this transcendence (the 'relation that goes beyond the world') within immanence, to wit the presence, proximity, immediacy one necessarily associates with the word 'experience.'"[114] (FF 26*t*) An interruption thus occurs within experience itself and, in this break of the Form/Concept with itself, the *oikos* is opened up and a space is prepared for the coming of the other in its infinite transcendence. As Derrida asks in "Living On," does the space to let the other come not always occur from the propriety of one's economy or ecology? Indeed, but the anonymous interruption of the *oikos* by the other had always already dwelled therein.[115]

How I read general ecology will thus necessarily require a passage through what one might call the restricted economies of transcendental phenomenology in the Living Present and the ontological question of Being.[116] Levinas, as I will show in my next two chapters, identifies both phenomenology and ontology with philosophies of violence. Ethics, for Levinas, is beyond ontology, and it constitutes phenomenology's interruption of itself by itself as the other.[117] But it is as much a mistake, I believe, to suggest that deconstruction can only manage an economy of violence, a differantial of force and power, as it is to suggest that an absolute break with such differantials would even be desirable; in both cases – the pure immanence of force and power and the purity of the relation transcending these – an uncontaminated purity comes down to the worst; a pure life that is pure death. It is then through the logic *pas au-delà* that one must situate Derrida's ethics and the immense, perhaps irresolvable debt it owes to Levinas.

The open door of the *oikos*, to return to "Living On," calls forth an infinite exteriority and transcendence. But this opening is irreducible to a simple passivity, or a passivity that would be opposed to activity. Again, one rediscovers the logic of the relation *without* relation I noted in §1.2.2.[118] One must read the politics of everything Derrida says about an economy of violence, and everything Nietzsche, Deleuze and Foucault write about a immanent differantial of forces and power in terms of this beyond-within, "transcendence within immanence," structuring force with a vulnerability and weakness.[119] It is necessary, Derrida writes, to invent a new relation to every concept, to the Concept itself, "the non-dialectical enclosure of its own transcendence, its 'beyond within.'" (AEL 152/85) Let me recall that différance involves both the economic *same* and the *other*, "absolutely heterogeneous, radically different, irreducible and untranslatable, the

aneconomic, the wholly other or death" (DQ 74/40*t*) General ecology can be thought as this strange logic that non-dialectically inscribes what exceeds it as a transcendence within the immanence of any restricted ecology.[120]

> The concept exceeds itself, goes beyond its own borders, which amounts to saying that it interrupts itself or deconstructs itself so as to form a sort of enclave inside and outside of itself: '*beyond within*' once again... each time this topological enclave affects a concept, a process of deconstruction is in progress, which is no longer a teleological process or even a simple event in the course of history. (AEL 146/80*t*)

This is how survivance and life death break with the teleological, logocentric and politically nefarious metaphysics of form, all the while differently from a move that would counter such discourses through the vitalization, empowerment and reinforcement of what was thus oppressed. Survivance and life death require a profound reorganization of our understanding of philosophy, epistemology, ontology and ethics and in our thinking of how living beings differentially structure and are structured by their environments. In contrast to the immediacy of immanence, the relation to the other, the outside, time and death are to be understood as a relationality without relationality, as much the relation as its constitutive interruptibility by way of the other's alterity and transcendence which makes the relation impossible. To comprehend the other in its incomprehensibility and non-knowledge is not to relapse into ignorance or obscurantism; precisely with respect to the concept of loss or expense in Bataille, Derrida writes, "what I propose is not at all a praise of the loss, it is a thought of affirmation that does not stop at the loss, or does not dialecticize something like the loss or the expense." (ALT 68) The relation with the other is that which interrupts economy, suspends the dialectic of the concept in a radically aneconomic difference which resists its reappropriation. To think the economic and the aneconomic together in différance is thus to think a relation of mediation without opposition which, Derrida adds, cannot sit easily with Hegelianism.

The Im-possible obliquely points beyond any discourse of originary violence, or of an allegedly irreducible drive for mastery, power, sovereignty and cruelty, as Nietzsche and Freud might put it, all the while affirming their necessity. The relation that goes beyond the world, the transcendence within immanence that discovers the underside of concepts, prepares a place to let the other come is, as Derrida puts it, an indirect way of challenging force, power, violence and sovereignty. It takes into account, "in the mediation of the detour, a radical discontinuity, a heterogeneity, a leap into the ethical (thus also the juridical and political)." (WA 273) Beyond

the economy of the appropriable and the possible, the Im-possible affirmation of life is without violence, force, power, sovereignty or cruelty. It comes "from a beyond the beyond, and thus from beyond the economy of the possible. It is attached to a life, certainly, but to a life other than that of the economy of the possible, an im-possible life, so doubt, a sur-vival... which owes nothing to the alibi of some mytho-theological beyond." (WA 276) We then need, Derrida writes in *Adieu*, a new relation to the concept of peace, a peace of the living, as Kant and Levinas put it, a metaphorico-conceptual effect or ruse of life death that remains to be invented.[121] And here, one can pick the thread of a 'metaphor' that has woven its way through all these texts on life death and survivance, that of translation. The peace of the living would be, Derrida suggests, an event of translation, an *other* translation, or rather, as he closes *Adieu*, "a thought of translation *to be invented*, a bit like politics itself." (AEL 210/123)

§1.4: Posthumanist Translation and the Biocultural Promise of the Earth

§1.4.1: The Ammetaphorics of Life in Benjamin's Translation-to-come

The stakes of translation have been at play in everything I've been discussing so far. Not only did I show Derrida discuss survivance through Benjamin's terms *fortleben* and *überleben* in his final interview, the first definition of différance I covered includes the untranslatable alongside the aneconomic, the wholly other, and the expenditure without reserve of death. Translation, as one might guess, is itself structured according to the double bind of life death. As Derrida writes in "Living On,"

> A text lives only if it lives on [*sur-vit*], and it lives on only if it is *at once* translatable and untranslatable... Totally translatable, it disappears as text, as writing, as a body of language [*langue*]. Totally untranslatable, even within what is believed to be *one* language, it dies immediately. This triumphant translation is neither the life nor the death of the text, only or already its living on, its life after life, its life after death. The same thing will be said of what I call writing, mark, trace, and so on. It [*Ça*] neither lives nor dies; it lives on. And it 'starts' only with living on. (P 147-9/128-9)

A text, like a living being, only survives in the stricture between a restricted ecology of total translatability, the total reappropriation of meaning without any material remainder, and the anecologically untranslatable.[122] As Derrida explains, Benjamin intends his vitalist conception of the survival of languages and texts in translation to be understood completely *unmetaphorically*. Its gesture does not consist in the extension of what we understand as organic, biological or zoological life, which would, Derrida notes, in fact be metaphorical. Rather, Benjamin invites us

to think life starting from history and spirit rather than nature. To understand life on the basis of a life that elevates itself beyond nature, a life that is in essence its survival is for Derrida a fundamentally Hegelian gesture, but one that requires the work of general ecology I've developed above.[123] In a 1976 seminar on Benjamin, Derrida complicates the former's notion of translation with respect to the opposition of (mechanical) production and (organic) reproduction I discussed in Jacob. Translation, he writes, is not sterile, it produces something living, "it does not relate two dead (beings) [*morts*] but two living (beings) [*vivants*], two living languages, like two living bodies whose copulation is not an equalization of two deaths but the production of a living being." (B3, 3*t*) Life in Benjamin's sense must thus be understood as both production and re-production, "life as the unity of origin and repetition, of pro and reproduction."[124] (B3, 4*t*) Translation can thus be said to structure organic experience, precisely in the general economy of an experience of the impossible; "let us say that translation is experience, which one can translate or experience also: experience is translation." (P1 234/223) But this impossibility, as I just explained, is also an ethics; the task of translation is necessary and impossible for Derrida, necessary *as* impossible. Translation is ethically bound to the sur-vival of the work to ensure that it not only live longer, but more and better, and it assures not only the survival of a corpus, text or author, but of languages themselves.[125]

The notion of translation at stake in these chapters is neither a metaphor for thinking how living beings, texts and languages relate to one another and their environments, nor is it a dialectical Concept permitting the overcoming of error and misunderstanding. Rather, I read the aporetics of translation precisely as an originary effect of life death, a general text that begins by repeating and translating itself. Translation would thus be another name for différance and iterability. If the metaphor is the proper of the human, as Derrida suggests in "White Mythology," and indeed dialectically complicit with the Concept, the notion of translation I'm interested here would exceed the oppositions between the human and its other, *physis* and *technè*.[126] To think translation as an originary ruse of life death would immediately relate its operations to non-sense and error. It would problematize the 'proper' sense of translation as one between two self-identical and self-enclosed languages, since no relation between these could ever be stabilized once and for all. This will be of fundamental importance to a non-metaphorical ecological conception of language, as I will show in my discussion of ecolinguistics in chapter 6.

Translation for Derrida operates according to two trajectories, first of all according to the restricted economy of the *Aufhebung*, in the aim of the economic reappropriation of sense into univocity, whereby, following Plato and Leibniz, plurivocity can be mastered in view of sense and truth.[127] This is a situation in which the translator could economically absolve himself of his indebted position before the text: a translation without remainder, a pure economic equivalence between two languages. But such a translation would not ensure the sur-vival of the text, but rather sign its death sentence. To say that a text only lives-on if it is both totally translatable and totally untranslatable is also to say, for Derrida, that nothing is untranslatable while nothing is translatable.[128] Any language or text, so long as it lives-on, dwells in the double bind between these two possibilities. What *is* impossible to translate, what resists this dialectic, is the materiality of the letter. Derrida notes this in "Freud and the Scene of Writing;" "the materiality of a word [*un corps verbal*] does not let itself be translated or transported into another language. Materiality is precisely that which translation lets go. To let materiality go, such is the essential energy of translation. When it reinstitutes materiality, translation becomes poetry."[129] (ED 312/264) Benjamin's interest is the sacred text in translation, which makes translation necessary and impossible because literality, materiality and meaning are inseparable within it; an irreplaceable and untransferable *event*, as Derrida puts it.[130] But this articulation of the material and the semiotic is no more limited to sacred texts than poetry; its role in contemporary science and technology studies (in the work of Donna Haraway and Karen Barad) is something I will examine closely in chapter 6.[131] The materiality of the letter calls for translation, but it is also that by which any economy of translation interrupts itself, vows itself to an absolute dissemination and non-reappropriability. The inextricable bind between the material and the semiotic must be thought in a '*pas de sens*,' the material-semiotic would be nothing without translation, and translation nothing without the material-semiotic.[132] As Derrida puts in "Fidelity to (no) More than One," returning us to Bataille and Blanchot's concept of experience,

> this *pas-de-sens* is not only negative. It is not a loss, it is also the chance of a word [*parole*], an irruption of sense, it is the chance in the *pas-de-sens*, through it; and the bordering between of this 'through' is experience, the experience that is authority, but an authority that expiates itself, as Blanchot and Bataille say, more or less. (FP 28*t*)

The material-semiotic communicates nothing outside of its own event, and one is thus placed in a dual fidelity before it: on the one hand to its untranslatability, but on the other to think this untranslatability otherwise, in an engagement to translate within the experience of the

untranslatable, where its alterity exposes translation to an ineluctable movement of ex-appropriation.[133] The transgression of translation discovers the material underside of the Concept or Form, and thus ensures the double survivance of the original both as *fortleben* and *überleben*, but only "by losing the flesh during a process of conversion... all the while preserving the mournful and debt-laden memory of the singular materiality [*corps*]." (TR 574/199) The triumph of translation is thus double, equivocally its success and a phase of mourning. As a work of mourning, translation is haunted by the memory of the materiality it must relinquish, this material *restance* that commands both its necessity and impossibility. One does not survive, and nor does the text live-on in translation, without mourning. Indeed, this impossible necessity structures a transcendence beyond human language; it is an experience of the passage beyond the human, its power and the sovereignty of its 'I can,' in the rupture of its economy. Translation engages something that "passes beyond humanity even as it passes through humanity, just as language does," something "above human language *in* human language, beyond the human order *in* the human order," an ethics and a responsibility "beyond human rights and duties *in* human law." (TR 568/188) It is itself the impossible experience of the beyond-within I spoke of in my previous section on Levinas, a *passion* of translation, as Derrida puts it, in which one ought to hear again the passivity of the *pas*, the transgression, transcendence, transfer, transformation, *travail*, he adds, as in the work of mourning, but also *trouvaille*; invention in all senses of the word.[134]

What Derrida calls the axial thesis of Benjamin's "Task of the Translator" is that communication is an inessential aspect of the work. Bad translations communicate too much. The translator's task is rather to make visible the hidden kinship between all languages, one which is not reducible to the simple lineage of language families, but something more enigmatic, Derrida writes, "perhaps even this kinship, this affinity (*Verwandschaft*), is like an alliance sealed by the contract of translation, to the extent that the sur-vivals that it associates are not natural lives, blood ties, or empirical symbioses." (P1 220/209) This intimate kinship is not to be sought in the domain of life, for Benjamin, but at a higher level; not in terms of kinship or the family in general, "on the contrary, it is on the basis of languages and relations among languages that one must begin to understand what 'life' and 'kinship' mean." (OA 162-3/123) As I will show in §1.4.2, the same is true of what Derrida calls the promise of the earth. It is only on the basis of relations between living beings in the material space of their inscription that we can

begin to think what ecology and relationality mean. Therein lies for Derrida the impossible possibility of the promissory and messianic character of translation; translation promises a reconciliation between languages that no translation itself could never succeed in accomplishing. It promises the being-language of language, I argue, in and as its materiality, as the arche-writing of ecological relationality. Materiality is both what makes the promise necessarily excessive and impossible to keep; in resisting translation, it both makes and lets the event come in what Derrida calls a language to come (*langue à venir*).[135] This making and letting the event come, he adds elsewhere, involves "a possible or impossible responsibility regarding sense and ab-sense (the absence of sense)," the sense of a responsibility to come. (FPC 58)

The structural and originary impossibility of translation, the interruption the material remainder poses to its economy, is itself the condition of this promise. It is also, Derrida writes, the condition of the social bond, because the social bond *requires* interruption, its binding only affirms itself in the stricture of an unbinding because the differences it binds together are never static or stabilized. The contradiction therein, however, is wholly other than that of the dialectical Concept, "it founds and overflows every dialectic. It removes itself from every dialectical horizon at the very moment where it seems to deploy or arrest it." (FP 5*t*) One can then suggest that the material remainder might be correlated to that of the impersonal, impossible death that doubles the restricted economy of personal death, the one that life simply delays and defers. The matter of my living being survives my personal death, and the impersonal death of its decomposition proceeds long after I die, and even then it allows other forms of life to live-on. This passion of death, as I showed Derrida draw from Blanchot, entails a shared co-passion before this inexperienceable experience as the very condition of the social bond, an ecological bond; indeed an ecological *bind* understood in the stricture of general ecology. I mentioned above that the passion of translation ought be understood beyond the opposition of the human to its others, the natural to the cultural. Like the task of the translator, what one might still call environmental ethics entails letting life live-on, and not only the life of individual organisms, but the life of species, ecosystems, languages, cultures, all of these given to be thought in the imperative of biocultural sustainability; each an irreducible and singular form of alterity, "one other or some other persons, but also places, animals, languages." (DM 101/71)

In a discussion of Husserl and Heidegger's concept of world, which I will amply develop in my next two chapters, Derrida suggests that the unity without unity of the world is one I share

with every living being which has the 'same' experience as I do. This experience is that by which I know that my singular world is both absolutely untranslatable and heterogeneous, and yet there is some translatable 'world' of which the infinity of untranslatable worlds is the very condition; "I am bound, in this social un-binding, to anyone whosoever and the hospitality unconditionally opened to the arrivant should open me onto the arrivant whatever it may be, but also to what one so easily calls an animal or a god. Good or evil, life or death." (FP 28*t*) And it is this unity without unity of the world within which one can think life death (not 'life *and* death' or 'life *is* death') on earth or in the world, as Derrida puts it in *La Vie la mort*, "if we call *world* this unity without totality, without homogeneity, which nonetheless allows one to think together, according to a logic which is neither that of the *is* nor of the *and,* neither that of identity or opposition, différance." (L5, 11*t*)

§1.4.2: Avowing: The Impossible Promise of Ecology

Blanchot, in his *Unavowable Community,* follows Bataille in thinking the experience of the impossible as the logic binding all community, as he cites the latter, "*the Community of those who do not have a community*." (BCI 9/1) Community is both a sharing and partitioning, a *partage*, as will be essential in Esposito's readings of *Communitas*, of an experience whose sole content is "to be untransmittable, which can be completed thus: the only thing worthwhile is the transmission of the untransmittable." (BCI 35/18) Blanchot's thought of community further stakes itself against communion, fusion and immanence, emphasizing instead the finitude of the beings composing it at its principle. As he cites Bataille, it is the death of the other that structures the impossible separation that opens any living being outside itself, onto the expropriation and dispossession of community. I will have much to say about this originary mourning structuring the general ecology of community in a moment, community simply being another word for what I would call ecology in general, structured by what Blanchot and Bataille call the excess of a lack, transcendence, the impossibility of its immanence, an exteriority that excludes even sovereignty.[136] This exteriority that thought cannot master has many names, "death, the relation to the other, or speech when the latter is not folded up in ways of speaking and does not permit any relation (of identity or alterity) with itself." (BCI 25/12) All of these, it seems, weave together the unknowable and incalculable singularities to which biocultural sustainability owes its infinite responsibility, to the deaths of others, to words, texts and languages, before and

beyond any determination as human. An unknowability that is not the dialectical counterpart of the known structures every community, friendship and hospitality for Derrida, in respecting the transcendence and infinite distance of the other. The interruption of death, however, makes the all these other interruptions possible, and all finite beings "know that life does not go without death, and that death is not beyond, outside of life, unless one inscribes the beyond in the inside, in the essence of the living."[137] (SM 224/176-7) The beyond-within, again, as the possible knowledge of the im-possible is, as Derrida draws from Levinas, the site of an absolute responsibility: "a passivity that is not only the possibility of death in being, the possibility of an impossibility, but an impossibility that is prior to this possibility, the impossibility of slipping away. Our impossibility, in short, before or prior to death, standing before death, before the dead, beyond death." (AEL 150/83) The impersonal death that is impossible to die and of which I make the impossible experience is what is shared and partitioned out in what I'm calling general ecology.

If Blanchot speaks of the unavowable community, Derrida picks up on this notion in "Avowing: the Impossible" to further elaborate on the experience of the impossible as structuring the community of any living-together on earth. Any *ensemble* of living together [*vivre ensemble*] only does itself justice, he writes, where it exceeds the 'ensemble' of any living being, system or totality that would simply be the sum of its parts. The justice of living together *well* must interrupt both the sense of an organic or natural totality and that of a politico-juridical contract, it would thus be beyond any opposition between *physis/nomos*, *physis/thesis*, nature/convention, biological life/law, any opposition between nature and culture.[138] It must do so because the differences between its members (and these members from themselves) are never fixed, but are structured in on-going processes of differentiation. Living together well, Derrida writes

> supposes an interruptive excess *both* with respect to the statuary convention of law *and* with respect to *symbiosis*, of the symbiotic, gregarious, or fusional living-together... Any living-together that would limit itself to the symbiotic or would regulate itself on a figure of the symbiotic or the organic is the first mistake in the sense and of the '*il faut*' of the '*vivre ensemble.*' (DJ 33-4*t*)

All these seemingly economic aporias, those of the law of the *oikos,* the home and the proper ought to be connected to the question of ecology, Derrida adds; "this great and new dimension of 'living together.'" (DJ 61*t*) Since the ecology of life death on earth must be thought beyond the

opposition of nature to culture, it articulates a space for thinking an ethics of biocultural sustainability, one of originary mourning for the countless species and languages threatened with extinction today; an impossible mourning, no doubt, but one that originarily institutes an infinite responsibility.

The idea of 'life' in the ecology of living together, however, is by no means simple; it cannot simply concern itself with those presently living. It is also one of living together with those no longer and those not yet living in the present. It thus structures an anachrony at the heart of the present; indeed, Derrida adds, of the Living Present, posing an irreducible complication to the concept at the heart Husserlian phenomenology.[139] This interruption within the Living Present structures community as a *partage*, "it is a sharing out without fusion, a community without community, a language without communication, a being-with without confusion." (LT 221/195) As he writes in *Aporias*,

> Survivance structures each instant in a kind of irreducible torsion, that of a retrospective anticipation introducing *contretemps* and the posthumous in the most living of the living present, the rearview mirror of a waiting-for-death [*s'attendre-à-la-mort*] at every moment, the future-anterior that precedes even the present it appears only to modify.[140] (A 102/55*t*)

This structure of arche-mourning does not so much oppose an ontology of life so much as provide a complication of *life death* as the basis from which one can speak of any living subjectivity, he adds. That one will survive the other originarily installs the relation between any two finite singularities; it is neither the death of the other which is primary and instigates my responsibility as it is for Levinas, nor the *Jemeinigkeit* of my death as my ownmost proper possibility as I've shown in Freud and will explore in Heidegger in chapter 3.[141] To carve out a position between Heidegger and Levinas would require thinking both my death and that of the other as intimately bound up the one with the other, and thus in a shared apprehension of life's precariousness and grievability.[142] Death is the ex-propriation of any ipseity, of anything proper to the human. 'We' are never 'ourselves' in the anachrony of ecological relationality, and this is due not only to the irreducibly relational condition of any living singularity, but to the fact that we are structurally haunted by the ghosts of environmental and biocultural degradation, perhaps even retroactively haunted by the incalculable deaths of indeterminable species, cultures, languages and other irreplaceable singularities to come, each one, each time, as the end of the world. Ethics itself, Derrida's thought seems to suggest, necessitates learning to live with these

revenants more justly, more faithfully, perhaps in a promise that can only be in excess of itself, since it must indeed give the world, given to us from even beyond an evolutionary history.

> The *self* [soi-même] has that relation to itself only *through* the other, through the promise (for the future, as trace of the future) made to the other as an absolute past, and thus *through* this absolute past, by the *grace* of the other whose sur-vival – that is, whose being-mortal – will have always exceeded the 'we' of a common present. (MPD 77-8/6*t*)

I've shown that différance structures everything in a network of differential relationality, and that every identity in order to live-on must both economically affirm itself in returning to itself as it affirms its aneconomic exposure to others and to death. This strange ecological bond across the anachrony and contratemporality at the heart of the living present allows us to conclude with the promise of survivance and general ecology, just as I'd shown the "Task of the Translator" promise a kingdom of reconciliation between languages, a kingdom also forbidden. The structure of différance on the one hand deploys a thought of the promise as one that can be kept and calculated, while on the other one that exceeds all horizon of expectation and calculability. In a little-read preface to Serge Margel's *Le Tombeau du dieu artisan*, Derrida introduces what he calls the promise of the earth. Anterior to any I, you, he she or it promises, Derrida writes, "*nous nous promettons*," we promise one another, we promise ourselves. General ecology, to paraphrase, must be understood as "a 'we' without assured gathering, without intersubjectivity, without community or reciprocity, a strange dissymmetrical 'we,' anterior to every social bond," requiring "dispersion or distraction, the absolute interruption of absolutes, the *ab-solute* or *ab-solved* [l'ab-solu] in a certain being-in-the-world which will have preceded everything." (AV 40*t*) This element of the incalculable, the wholly other and the untranslatable punctures through any horizon of expectation for the promise. Without it, what is promised in the promise would come down to a simple calculation of the future. What Derrida calls ethical responsibility, indeed ethical passion, is to promise more than what can be kept; the promise must be excessive. But responsibility is thus aporetic, one must both be responsible for keeping what one promises, and before the singular event of the promise as unforeseeable, without concept or sense. Everything involved in the promise involves a *negotiation* between these two differantial senses of responsibility, both to the economic and the aneconomic, or better, Derrida writes, a *transaction*.[143] The temporality of the promise is thus one of an originary excess, the time of the loss, of an expenditure without possible restitution, but also of an absolute gift; the 'contretemps' of an unkeepable promise.[144] To anticipate the stakes of my next two chapters,

Derrida writes that this pre-chronological or anachronical time of the promise would be irreducible to and 'older' than the time of Husserl (chapter 2) and Heidegger (chapter 3).[145] It will also require, as my discussion on the untranslatable in "Fidélité à plus d'un" suggested, a total reorganization of the concept of being-in-the-world at stake in phenomenology and ontology, as the promise "is not in the world, for the world 'is' (promised) within the promise, according to the promise." (AV 39*t*)

> Finite promise *of* the world, as world: it is up to 'us' to make the world survive; and we cannot say that this question is not urgently important today; it always is and always will have been, each time it can be a matter – or not – of giving oneself death, that is to say the end of the world; it is thus up to 'us' to make what 'we' inadequately call the human earth survive, an earth 'we' know is finite, that it can and must exhaust itself in an end. But 'we' will have to change all these names, beginning with ours... life itself will no longer be what we thought it was. (AV 39*t*)

§1.5: Pre-Concluding Re-Marks and Re-Pro-gramme

What then, to do? "What to do? What are we going to do with the earth, on the earth? And the question... is not only an ecological question, even if it remains on the horizon of what ecology could have as its most ambitious and radical today." (QF 48-9*t*) The ethics of biocultural sustainability comes down to taking on, as Derrida puts it in "Avances," the inheritance of an unkeepable promise. The program of arche-writing discovers a logic of heredity and inheritance in a way that completely overflows the limits between the human and its others, the natural and the technical, the organic and the inorganic, life and death. Both genetic and cultural/linguistic heredity operate according to a dual movement of reproduction and selection. One cannot, in this framework, put forth anything like a program of rules or norms in the interest of biocultural sustainability, since even the decision at stake in inheriting ultimately comes from the other, in its alterity and transcendence, and before which I am infinitely, indeed mechanically passive. And yet, precisely because of this necessary excess and failure, responsibility also consists in attempting to put forward such a program by way of rules and norms. But this responsibility is taken in the name of the other, as another, "that in short takes on the survival of the cosmos, or our world in any case... What are we going to do, what must we do with the earth?" (AV 27*t*) To inherit this promise from a time even beyond evolutionary history is itself no longer reducible to a simple question, perhaps even less one of 'what to do?' and especially 'what must I do?,' although it must of course calculate its debt through these. To inherit justly would perhaps not only come down to restituting the originary an-economy of the promise of the earth, but to

maintain this disjunction in the passivity of a certain letting, a certain deferral of its fulfillment, "deferring not what it affirms but deferring just *so as* to affirm, to affirm *justly*, so as to have the power (a power without power) to affirm the coming of the event, its future-to-come itself." (SM 41/19) As Derrida puts it in *For What Tomorrow*, "one must do everything to appropriate a past even though we know that it remains fundamentally inappropriable." (DQ 15/3*t*) To reaffirm the inheritance of a promise before time is not only accepting this heritage, "but relaunching it otherwise and keeping it alive." (DQ 15/3) Life itself, Derrida writes, must be thought on the basis of inheritance and the double injunction to both passively receive and to affirm, to say yes to, and to choose to make what one inherits live on otherwise, perhaps even more and better, but always with the risk of the worst. It thus requires, Derrida writes,

> two gestures at once: both to leave life in life and to make it live again, to save life and to 'let live' in the most poetic sense of this phrase... To know how to 'leave' and to 'let' [*laisser*], and to know the meaning of 'leaving' and 'letting' – that is one of the most beautiful, most hazardous, most necessary things I know of... The experience of a 'deconstruction' is never without this, without this love, if you prefer that word. (DQ 17/4-5)

Justice is above life, beyond life or the life drive, in a sur-viving of which the *sur*, the transcendence of the 'sur' – if it is a transcendence – remains to be interpreted.

Jacques Derrida, *The Death Penalty: Volume 1*, 366/271.

Two: Transcendence and the Surviving Present

In justifying the necessity of a detailed investigation of Derrida's earliest engagements with phenomenology, three references to Husserl's Living Present in Derrida's later work seem indispensible. The first in *The Animal that Therefore I Am*, where in reflecting on the relation of livingness [*vivance*] to death across the thresholds separating the human and its others, Derrida writes that "at the heart of all these difficulties, there is always the unthought side of a thinking of life (and it is by means of that, through the question of life and of the 'living present,' (...) that my deconstructive reading of Husserl began, as well, in fact, as everything that followed from that.)" (AS 153/111) Second, one reads in *Spectres of Marx* that the very possibility of justice, ethics and responsibility lies "beyond all living present, within that which disjoins the living present," or rather in the "non-contemporaneity with itself of the living present."[1] (SM 16/xviii)

> Justice carries life beyond present life and its actual being there, its empirical or ontological actuality: not towards death but towards a *living-on*, [*sur-vie*] namely, a trace of which life and death would themselves be but traces and traces of traces, a survival whose possibility in advance comes to disjoin or disadjust the identity to itself of the living present as well as of any effectivity. (SM 17-18/xx)

Third, one finds in "Eating Well" one of the clearest conjunctions of Derrida's problematization of the Husserlian Living Present and the ecological ethics I am pursuing here. For Derrida, the concept of transcendental passive genesis resisted, bracketed and avoided not only in Husserl's static analyses but in all subsequent so-called 'genetic' analyses (as the central thesis of Derrida's 1954 *The Problem of Genesis* claims) comes to join together the questions of temporality and alterity and leads back to a "pre-egological or pre-subjective zone" within which the subject appears as passively constituted by its relations to time and the other rather than actively constituting these. (PDS 277/263) The notion of a pre-egological transcendental field, also of huge importance to Deleuze, actually has its origins in Sartre's *The Transcendence of the Ego*, and does not appear in these words in Husserl, as far as I know.[2] But Derrida also notes a need, very early on, to move beyond the phenomenologies of Sartre and Merleau-Ponty towards one more attuned to the question of scientific objectivity.[3] Perhaps, to use Canguilhem's terms, a shift from '*le vécu*,' transcendental lived experience, to '*le vivant*,' the living being.[4] It is along

two axes, what one might call the 'organic,' ontological account of how the Living Present structures the life of the living being, and the 'teleological,' the questions of scientific ideality, translatability, objectivity and of how living beings share a world in the Living Present that my study will situate itself.

As I will show, Husserl and Derrida invariably tie both axes of Living Present to the materiality of 'nature' (albeit, I note, always a de-natured one) and of the earth (albeit not without some relation to 'world'), which authorizes, indeed necessitates the task of thinking these questions in terms of general ecology. At stake then will be a complication of what I'll call the restricted ecology of the Living Present through the interruptions posed by what Nicolas Abraham might call its 'transphenomenological' relations, those of intersubjectivity, the originary *hylè* or matter, time, death and all the other movements in *tr*-, transcendence, translation, and so on.[5] What all these have in common is not only their irreducibility to a monadic ego, but their intimate entanglement with one another in how the living being differentially shares the earth it lives and dies on with its others. The beyond-within of the *Living* Present, its *sur-vivance*, inscribes a transcendence and a spacing within the mutual immanence and self-presence of empirical and transcendental life, of *le vécu*, one with important epistemological, ontological, ethical and indeed ecological implications. Ethics, as I showed in my last chapter, is precisely phenomenology's auto-interruption, the interruption of itself from within by itself, an interruption that will engage a thorough deconstruction of its notions of life, history and teleology.[6] However, Derrida remarks that what he calls the *trace* (another non-synonymous substitution for différance) can no more break from transcendental phenomenology than be reduced to it.[7] General ecology will thus think both a 'dialectical' ecology of the Living Present and the survivance made possible by its interruption in order to deepen our understanding of sharing life death on earth with its others more justly.

As Derrida argues, the relation to time and the other within the Living Present resists phenomenology in its very principle of principles: the absolute evidence and self-givenness of intuition.[8] But these relations will also come to designate the very possibility of ecological relationality. As Derrida puts it,

> How do I connect the question of the constitution of time (and the alterity within the living present) and the question of the other (of the 'alter ego' as Husserl would say)? Well my quick answer would be that the two alterities are indissociable... A living being *– whether a human being or an animal being – could not have any relation to another*

> *being* as such without this alterity in time, without, that is, memory, anticipation, this strange sense (I hesitate to call it knowledge) that every now, every instant is radically other and nevertheless in the same form of the now. Equally there is no 'I' without the sense as well that everyone other than me is radically other and yet able to say 'I,' that there is nothing more heterogeneous than every 'I' and nevertheless there is nothing more universal than the 'I.' (AWD 104*e*)

Derrida's accounts of the pre-subjective transcendental field and passive genesis, I'll show, not only take us beyond the alterity and transcendence of the human other in Levinas's ethics, but also beyond the almost exclusive focus on the question of 'the animal' which has preoccupied recent Derrida scholarship, allowing us to think ecological responsibility more broadly, across "what one calls the 'nonliving,' the 'vegetal,' the 'animal,' 'man,' or 'God.'' The question also comes back to the difference between the living and the nonliving."[9] (PDS 284/269) Beyond the idea of an unconditional obligation to every living being in general,

> it is not enough to say that this unconditional ethical obligation, if there is one, binds me to the life of any living being in general. It also binds me twice over to something nonliving, namely to the *present nonlife* or the *nonpresent life* of those who are not yet living, present living beings, living beings in the present, contemporaries – i.e. dead living beings and living beings not yet born, *nonpresent-living-beings* or *living beings that are not present.* One must therefore inscribe death in the concept of life. And you can imagine all the consequences this would have. (BS1 157/110)

This is precisely why the non-contemporaneity with itself of the Living Present structures the possibility of justice, community, indeed ecology as I remarked in my last chapter.[10]

Along with the intertwinement of temporality and alterity at the heart of the Living Present, it is also essential to appreciate in what way, for Derrida, phenomenology constitutes a philosophy of life, where time and the other also express "a way of questioning the concept of *life* in phenomenology – why *living* present?"[11] (DS 63) Phenomenology proposes a dual privileging of presence and life, within which the exteriorities, I'll say transcendences of alterity, temporality, materiality and death merely affect the Living Present as external accidental modifications. The Living Present will eventually for Derrida become coextensive with metaphysics itself and a volitional account of the subject. I noted in chapter 1 Derrida's comparison of the Living Present with the immanent propriation of the death drive, its adherence to metaphysical concepts of form, *eidos*, *oikos*, its incompatibility with the anachronic *contretemps* of mourning, or the promise of the earth, while I also discussed the necessity of thinking a non-dialectical *restance* that would not be a modification of presence, but would issue

from the transcendence of a past that has never been present, that would structure the transcendental field from its outside.

As I will show in this chapter, the passive geneses by which transcendental subjectivity is passively constituted rather than actively constituting designate an originary complication of the activity of the monadic ego, closely tying into a question to which Derrida would return in *The Animal*...; the ethical question concerning other living beings is not whether they can do this or that, nor one of extending transcendental activity to what was once denied it, but of interrogating the radical passivity shared across the living; the passive genesis of every Living Present as its relation to finitude, as a vulnerability and sufferability at the heart of the Living Present itself. This radical dispossession of the monadic ego thus counters even the phenomenological ethical thought of empathy as the recognition of an other ego as a centre of 'I can's.' In other words, the necessity of an interrogation of a radical passivity beyond the opposition of activity and subjectivity is as old as Derrida's philosophical project itself.[12]

The difficulties involved in the reconstruction of these philosophical footholds for the young Derrida, however, are not negligible, not only owing to the lack of a clear systematization of the concept of the Living Present in Husserl, but in Derrida as well. To put it all too quickly, Derrida reads the Living Present *favourably* in his early works on Husserl as seemingly representative of his own project and then later as a structure to be complicated and problematized.[13] In his 1954 thesis *The Problem of Genesis in Husserl's Philosophy*, Derrida acknowledges a clear debt to Tran Duc Thao's exposition of the Living Present in the latter's *Phenomenology and Dialectical Materialism*.[14] The Living Present thus receives a thoroughly dialectical formulation in Derrida's first book, one persisting in his 1962 introduction to Husserl's *The Origin of Geometry*. Through his development of the logic of the trace, however, Derrida comes to articulate this dialectics of the Living Present (its restricted ecology) with a Levinasian relation to an an-archic, immemorial, pre-historical past that has never been present, that would not constitute a modification of presence in retention and protention as past-present or future-present.

While continuing to appear sporadically in Derrida's work following the publication of his final book length study on Husserl, 1967's *Voice and Phenomenon*, indeed through to the questions of survivance and affirmation we will explore in later chapters, Derrida openly

acknowledges the Living Present as the very touchstone of the philosophical projects of the other two great figures looming within his own, Heidegger and Levinas.[15]

> Husserl's major works on time recognize an absolutely privileged form for what is called the 'living present.' This is sense, good sense even, at its most indisputable, in appearance: the originary form of experience is the self-presentation of the present; we never leave the present, which never leaves itself, and which no living thing ever leaves. This absolute phenomenological science, this undeniable authority of *now* in the living present – in different styles and with different strategies, it is this that has been the point to which all the major questionings of this kind of time, especially those of Heidegger and Levinas, have been directed. In a different move, with other aims, what I tried to elaborate using the word *trace* (that is, an experience of the temporal difference of a past without a present past or a to-come that is not a present future) is also a deconstruction, without critique, of that absolute and straightforward evidence of the living present, of consciousness as living present, of the originary form (*Urform*) of the time we call the living present (*lebendige Gegenwart*), or of everything that assumes the presence of the present. (PM 376/143-144)

Clearly, the philosophical stakes of the Living Present are high for deconstruction and its genealogy within contemporary continental philosophy. One the one hand, it is impossible for Derrida for a living being to exit the Living Present, to live an experience outside of the Living Present. This restricted ecological account of the Living Present is one Derrida will never renounce or cease to wrestle with although, particularly through his reading of Levinas, and recalling my remarks on im-possibility in my previous chapter, his later work will give us the opportunity to think this impossibility otherwise, as itself a condition of possibility: the Living Present can only maintain itself by exiting itself, by transcending itself, as the experience of its own impossibility. This experience of the impossible in the stricture of general ecology is the condition of possibility of sur-vivance and indeed of justice.

The first part of this chapter will attempt to historically reconstruct the logic of the Living Present in Derrida's earlier work. I'll begin in §2.1 by developing the dialectical account of the Living Present Derrida reads in Tran Duc Thao and show how this plays itself out on both proposed axes of my study, what I called the 'organic' (§2.1.1) and the 'teleological' (§2.1.2) with respect to the problem of genesis. In the latter, I'll examine various deployments of the Idea in the Kantian sense in Husserl, and show how these engage the questions of how living beings differentially share a world, one certainly attentive to their nonhuman origins and complications, but which ultimately decide in favour a subjectivist, metaphysical, Eurocentric, humanist, indeed anthropological teleology of life. In §2.2, I'll turn to the ethical problematizations posed to the

Living Present by Levinas, suggesting that this philosopher provokes a profound reorientation of Derrida's own relation to this notion, particularly alongside the former's notion of the trace: the enigma of the absolute alterity of the other issued from a past which has never been present.[16] But I'll also show that Derrida's reading of Levinas suggests the necessity of going beyond the ethical transcendence of the human other towards a more robust appreciation of ecological relationality, disclosing an underside and alterity to this anthropocentrism and Eurocentrism attentive to questions of death and finitude. Finally, in §2.3, I'll show how this reorientation plays out with respect to the questions of time, materiality and death in Derrida's concepts of trace, différance and arche-writing in section §2.3.1, and in §2.3.2 develop the implications therein concerning sharing the world with its others more justly, particularly with reference to Derrida's notion of democracy-to-come, of which David Wood has already proposed an eco-deconstructive reading as the 'parliament of the living,' irreducible to the Living Present and the Idea in the Kantian sense.[17]

§2.1: The Restricted Ecology of the Living Present in Husserl and Derrida

Before getting into Derrida's readings of Husserl, let me examine the long note from Tran Duc Thao Derrida credits for his understanding of the Living Present. The Living Present for the former is "the movement of primordial consciousness which is not *in time* but *constitutes time*: it is the *temporalizing temporality* always present to itself and which always is renewed in an eternity of life."[18] Husserl distinguishes between three temporalities c) objective, transcendent time, the time of nature and clocks, which is constituted within b) the immanent, transcendental, phenomenological time of subjective lived experience, *both* of which are constituted within a) the time of pre-immanence, a primordial and supratemporal temporality, "'the absolute subjectivity of 'time-consciousness,' or 'the consciousness which constitutes time,' in the primordial flux of the *Living Present*."[19] As absolute subjectivity, the Living Present is always and forever mine, belongs to the originary monad of my ego, and implies the entire universe of all other monads, the birth and death of the world and of all other egos: it is the condition of all being and all existence.[20] As would prove quite important for Derrida, the properties of absolute subjectivity cannot be named.[21] Tran Duc Thao's account of the Living Present is undeniably dialectical, evoking the movement of the *Aufhebung* I examined in chapter 1: "the movement of the *Living Present* consists in repeatedly *going beyond itself* by retaining within itself its past in

terms of its *annulled, preserved,* and *elevated* moment."[22] Its flow necessitates a permanent and primordial 'Now' that eternally holds together the retention of past moments and the protention of future ones, a dialectic of what is no longer and of what is not yet. The Living Present is thus "a preservation and perpetual conquest of self... the self remains identical to itself, while renewing itself constantly; it remains precisely the same only by always becoming another, in that *absolute flux of an eternal Present*."[23] Derrida's project in *The Problem of Genesis* can then be seen, as Leonard Lawlor argues, as a 'surenchère dialectique,' an upping the ante on this dialectics of the Living Present.[24] In other words, Derrida will show that the dialectical structure of the Living Present phenomenology necessitates and yet is originarily contaminated and compromised by the very transcendences of time, alterity and materiality Husserl wishes to bracket.

Derrida targets this originary complication of the Living Present through the concept of genesis in phenomenology. *The Problem of Genesis* begins by outlining an irreducible dialectic between two contradictory meanings of this term in Husserl; origin and becoming. On the one hand, genetic production occurs as absolute origin, as both an ontological and temporal originarity, its appearance and sense only occurring in "transcending what it is not." (PG 7/xxi) On the other hand, genesis only takes place within a context, within an ontological and temporal totality, in relation to a past and a future, "genesis is also an inclusion, an immanence." (PG 8/xxi) In fact, Derrida characterizes the very problem of genesis as a tension between transcendence and immanence.[25] While the dialectical nature of this text could seem to suggest that the two poles could be *aufgehoben*, Derrida seems to already be arguing for the necessity of going beyond dialectics in a dialectics of dialectics and non-dialectics, a "continuity of continuity and discontinuity, an identity of identity and alterity."[26] (PG 8/xx*t*) Reflecting on this "highly dialectizing first book" almost 40 years later, Derrida recalls that the most dialectical formulations of the dialectic in Hegel maintain themselves in a certain relation to the non-dialectical.[27] What Derrida sought to uncover in this logic was the element of a non-dialectical difference foreign to any dialectical system which "transcends a group of categories... more originary than the dialectic... a non-oppositional difference that transcends the dialectic, which is itself always oppositional." (TS 32) At once the conditions of possibility of the dialectical synthesis of the Living Present and the impossibility of its closure, Derrida recalls the logic of the '*without'* I discussed earlier, a 'synthesizing without synthesis' inscribing a weakness within

the dialectical invulnerability of the Living Present as the condition of possibility of justice.[28] Derrida's argument throughout *The Problem of Genesis* and really everything that follows will always show that whatever Husserl attempts to bracket and reduce as inauthentic or inadmissible within phenomenology, most notably the transcendences and geneses of temporality and alterity, not only constitute the very possibility of phenomenology but the impossibility of the purity of its analyses, their originary contamination.

In "Form and Meaning," Derrida suggests that the concept of form can serve as a guiding thread for thinking Husserlian phenomenology as this movement of purification. Nowhere is this more evident, he adds, than in the fact that "Husserl determines the *living present (lebendige Gegenwart)* as the ultimate, universal, absolute *form* of transcendental experience in general." (MP 188/158) As Form itself, the Living Present will have determined all concepts of *eidos* and *morphe* to be thought in terms of presence in general.[29] Its dialectic, I'll show, structures not only a certain organic individualism, grounded in the domain of action and possibility, but corresponds to what Derrida critiques in Michel Henry's 'material phenomenology,' the two being dialectical mirror images of one another in their emphases on pure 'transcendental life,' the pure life of the living, absolute immanence, the immanence of 'feeling one-self alive,' transcendental vitalism, the mutual immanence of the transcendental and the empirical, of the 'form' and norm of life.[30] This section, to proceed in two parts, will begin by elaborating the auto-affection at play in every organism, a certain (restricted) autopoiesis if you will, in its self-transcendence in and as originary temporalization, transcendental intersubjectivity and the material *hylè*, dialectically relating openness and closure, identity and alterity, form and matter, passing through Spinoza, Hans Jonas, Merleau-Ponty and Evan Thompson's phenomenologies of the organism. In §2.1.2, I will show how this dialectic comes to structure scientific and historical investigation and the problematics of communication and translation in sharing the world with its others. The teleological orientation of the dialectic of the Living Present, however, comes to structure a thought of science and history with important anthropocentric and Eurocentric overtones. The necessity of its deconstruction in an ethics of biocultural sustainability therefore cannot be overstated.

§2.1.1: The Dialectical Form of the Living Present in Organic Life: Time, the Other, Hylè

In the C-Manuscripts, Husserl writes of the future-oriented movement of protention as a purely auto-affective instinct and drive (*Trieb*) for self-preservation, of an "instinctual striving as a moment of affect... is originary affect not instinct?" (Hua M 8 326) Thompson's account of biological autopoiesis is a great place to develop this since it ties together by name questions of phenomenology, self-transcendence, Form and the Living Present, drawing on Jonas.[31] In *The Phenomenon of Life*, the latter notes that even the most primitive forms of life are endowed with what he calls an internal horizon of transcendence. At the heart of the most elementary forms of organic irritability and affectivity lies an experience of otherness, world and object: life is always precariously balanced between being and nonbeing, life and death, self and world, form and matter, freedom and necessity. All of these, he writes, "are forms of relation: life is essentially relationship, and relation as such implies 'transcendence,' a going-beyond-itself on the part of that which entertains the relations."[32]

As the basis of life, transcendence for Jonas is grounded on a certain emancipation, an indeed 'dialectical' freedom of form from the self-identity and fixity of matter. Similar to my discussion of Bataille, metabolism – the exchange of matter with its environment – constitutes the self-transcendence of the living being, which maintains the identity of its living form despite its constantly changing materiality, problematizing the very boundaries between interior and exterior. This fundamental 'sovereignty' of Form with respect to matter grounds both life's spatial and temporal self-transcendence beyond its own immediacy, both outward towards its environment or world and forward towards the future.[33] This dimension of futurity, or protention for Husserl, is more fundamental than the retention of past moments for organic life for Jonas; life's concerns and appetitions are all *futurally* determined. This is what Jonas calls the *immanent teleology* of life. Life survives precisely by not being identical with its matter; if organic form were to become identical with its material content, it would cease to live.[34] Jonas therefore finds what he calls the 'survival standard' inadequate in the evaluation of life; "if mere assurance of permanence were the part that mattered, life should never have started out in the first place. It is essentially precarious and corruptible being, an adventure in mortality."[35] Jonas' ethics of nature intends to think together, as many environmental philosophers do, a conjunction of ethics and ontology, one sidestepping the naturalistic fallacy in thinking together an 'ought' with the nature

of being in general. But again, how this articulation gives itself to be thought is really a question of all the difference in the world.

For Jonas, any epistemology, ontology or ethics must be thought on the basis of life. One can read a similar account in Thompson's account of biological autopoiesis (or self-production) as self-transcendence, drawing on Merleau-Ponty's dialectical concept of form as the co-emergence of inside and outside in any organism, where every autonomous being "meets the environment on its own sensorimotor terms."[36] Drawing from the latter's *The Structure of Behaviour*, and closely paralleling Canguilhem, the organism actively structures how external stimuli are received by way of its internal norms. The dual process by which an organism is structurally closed with respect to its norms and open to its environment corresponds to Merleau-Ponty's concept of form for Thompson.[37] Thompson's account of autopoiesis also draws on Jonas' notion of self-transcendence, even if it seems to ignore much of what the latter writes about death, citing Jonas' description of "the effort and power of life to preserve itself, to stay in existence" in the Spinozist conatus as the immanent purposiveness and teleology of life. But what Spinoza did not realize, Jonas writes, is that "the *conatus* to persevere in being can only operate as a movement that goes constantly *beyond* the given state of things."[38]

What Jonas for his part did not realize, Thompson suggests, is that the self-transcendence of the Living Present in protention and retention and its dialectic of openness and closure are themselves natural conditions of the autopoietic structure of every organism. Thompson's account of autopoiesis thus corresponds to what I'd call the restricted ecology of the Living Present; a life that transcends itself towards its exteriorities in time, the material world, alterity and even death, but only to survive these, strive, persevere and persist in existence. For Thompson, the Living Present itself can be understood as a pre-reflexive self awareness, a feeling of being alive, drawing from Maine de Biran's '*feeling of existence*,' as the form constituting life's immanent purposiveness.[39] He thus understands the living being in its concern to keep going, oriented towards the future, describing its consciousness precisely according to the Living Present: "Consciousness is a self-constituting flow inexorably directed toward the future and pulled by the affective valence of the world."[40] Again, it's not my intention to suggest all these thinkers say the same thing, but to show a powerful dialectical code at work in each concerning form, organic life and purposiveness at the heart of the Living Present, one which Derrida gives us good ethico-political, even ecological reasons to interrogate.[41] Let's now

examine this logic as it plays out in Derrida's reading of Husserl with respect to the problem of genesis.

What Derrida calls the problem of genesis in Husserl is more precisely one of passive genesis: the structures by which transcendental subjectivity is passively constituted leading back to a space where the active mastery of the subject is held in check; the pre-egological, pre-subjective transcendental field. For the young Derrida, Husserl will invariably attempt to bracket these movements in his descriptions; the transcendences of temporalization, alterity and the material *hylè* always appear post-genetically, that is to say as already constituted by a subject, since these problematize the very principle of all principles of phenomenology. In Husserl's words, this principle is "that *every primordial dator Intuition* is *a source of authority (Rechtsquelle) for knowledge*, that *whatever presents itself in 'intuition' in primordial form* (as it were in its bodily reality), *is simply to be accepted as it gives itself out to be,* though *only within the limits in which it presents itself*." (Hua 3 §24) As Derrida explains, time and the other radically complicate the principle of principles since they cannot be thought within the metaphysics of subjective presence.[42] Husserl could have avoided these difficulties, however, in allowing a space for genesis as a dialectics between phenomenology and what Derrida then calls ontology or existence.[43] If Husserl would continue to mix and treat together the passive genetic transcendences of originary temporalization, transcendental intersubjectivity and the *hylè*, (time, the other and matter) as late as the C-Manuscripts, it is because, Derrida writes, *"at bottom, their meaning from the point of view of a transcendental idealism is the same*: a simple explicitation of the transcendental ego as such, in its monadicity, cannot account for their existence and for the constitution of their sense." (PG 239/148*e*) To posit 'existence' as temporalization or alterity at the heart of the transcendental ego would mark the impossibility of any pure and simple phenomenological origin, an originary contamination between the worldly and the transcendental, and thus would signal both the collapse of phenomenology and a necessary shift to Heideggerian ontology.[44] In a sense, the problems Derrida poses to phenomenology are its own. It is because Husserl brackets the self-constituting and originary dialectic of the Living Present that the problems of temporalization and alterity cause its analyses to founder.

Husserl first gestures at the Living Present in a series of lectures published as *Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time*, where the study of immanent time consciousness requires the bracketing of the 'transcendences' of objective time, objective space

and the material world.[45] However, the intentional structure of consciousness as consciousness-*of* requires an originary impression of time that is material or 'hyletic,' which is then unified with other impressions by means of protention and retention, allowing for the constitution of a temporal object.[46] What is the difference, Derrida asks, between the transcendence of an originary impression within immanent time consciousness and its transcendence within objective time? For Husserl, the retained moment is *reell*, belongs to transcendental consciousness, but is not *real*, is not an empirical object of the world.[47] The *hylè*, for its part, is

> a real [*réelle*] but non-intentional component of lived experience. It is the sensate (lived and non-real [*réale*]) material of affect before any animation by intentional form. It is the pole of pure passivity, of the non-intentionality without which consciousness would never receive anything *other* to itself, nor exercise its intentional activity. This receptiveness is also an essential opening. (ED 243/205)

Elsewhere, he adds, "the *hylè* is the sensible material of lived experience." (PCM 79/114) It is not a thing in the world, not the reality of a natural, physiological or psychological sensation, but its appearing as pure sensible quality.[48] Hyletic matter is neither the transcendent matter of the perceived thing nor the materiality of the subjective perceiving body. Once animated by an intentional *morphe*, the originary impression becomes a temporal, noematic object, protended and retained in time consciousness. But the *noema*, correlate of an intending *noesis*, does not belong to consciousness in a *reell* way. The distinction between the reality of the material impression and its phenomenological appearing is extremely subtle, and the source of much debate between phenomenologists.[49] If Husserl settles for a constituted *hylè-morphè* correlation, however, and does not wish to engage discussions on "*formless materials* and *immaterial forms*," it is because the pure passivity of the formless *hylè* would compromise phenomenology in its principle of principles. (Hua 3 §85)

Let me now examine what one might call a dual transcendence of the Living Present, on the one hand the necessity of its material impression, and on the other its unnameable movement of temporalization. As is well known, Husserl defines the structure of consciousness as intentional because all consciousness is consciousness *of* something, always *intends* towards something.[50] The structure of intentionality requires that immanent time consciousness constitute itself through the appearing of a material impression prior to its animation by the activity of a transcendental subject. With this, Derrida argues, Husserl announces the theme of passive genesis the latter would return to fifteen years later. If an impression must precede any

retention, the passive reception of the hyletic datum thus reintroduces a transcendent object within internal time consciousness.[51] The originary passivity of the *hylè* is in fact a passivity before real, factical nature that can only be dialectically reconciled with phenomenological, noematic temporality, an originary synthesis of constituting and constituted, present and non-present, originary and objective temporality.

On the one hand, then, the consciousness of internal time is constituted by this originary hyletic impression. *On the other hand,* Husserl writes that transcendental subjectivity is itself constituted by *something else*: a pre-immanent, pre-objective flux uniting the originary impression in the retention of a past-present and the protention of a future-present: the constituting flux of the Living Present as absolute subjectivity. As Husserl writes in the lectures, this flux is nothing objective, and can only be understood as flux by way of metaphor, we lack all names for its absolute properties.[52] For Derrida, however, even the descriptions in the C-manuscripts describing the originary synthesis between absolute subjectivity and the constituting flux of time will fail to adequately address the problem of genesis, since an originary dialectics between time and subjectivity would be irreducible to a monadic ego.[53]

> Temporal dialectics constitutes alterity *a priori* in the absolute identity of the subject with itself. The subject originarily appears to itself as a tension of Same and Other. The theme of a transcendental intersubjectivity instituting transcendence at the heart of the absolute immanence of the 'ego' has already been called for. The last foundation of the objectivity of intentional consciousness is not the intimacy of the 'I' to itself but [is] Time or the Other." (PG 126/66*t*)

The absolutely unique and universal form of the Living Present is thus nothing other than the maintaining of the dialectic of protention and retention, identity and alterity. "It is in the movement of a protention that the present retains and surpasses itself as past present, in order to constitute *another* originary and original Absolute, another Living Present... this extraordinary absolute alteration of what always remains in the concrete and lived form of an absolute Present." (IOG 46/58*t*) This constitution of an *other* here and now within the unique and irreducible form of the Living Present, of another monad in my own, is the very root of intersubjectivity, and I think of ecological relationality. Beyond a simple analogical relation between intersubjectivity and temporalization, Derrida writes, the C-manuscripts define the originary *hylè* or *urhylè* both as temporal *hyle* and as *Ichfremde Kern*, the 'kernel of the *other*-to-I.'[54] The *hylè* is not only first and foremost temporal matter, but "the possibility of genesis itself,"

a genesis that Husserl will always defer "and within which the themes of the other and of Time were to have permitted their irreducible complicity to appear." (ED 244/205)

> Dialectics here being originary, the constituted constitutes the constituting and inversely; the absolute monad originarily welcomes 'the other'; *whether that 'other' be the antepredicative existence of the sensuous thing, or time or of an 'alter ego,'* ...So the pure 'I' must constitute itself temporally, in a dialectical genesis composing passivity and activity." (PG 166/96*t,e*)

The other, whether as time, the alter ego or matter are all revealed to dialectically be constituted by transcendental subjectivity, as they constitute it in turn, in the Form of the Living Present. These reflections will lead Derrida to conclude his introduction to Husserl's *Origin of Geometry* with a thought of transcendental difference, "originary Difference of the absolute Origin." (IOG 171/153*t*) At the end of the most radical phenomenological reduction, Derrida writes, we find

> absolute transcendental subjectivity as pure passive-active temporality, as pure auto-temporalization of the Living Present – i.e. as we *already* saw, as intersubjectivity. Discursive and dialectical intersubjectivity of Time with itself in the infinite multiplicity and infinite implication of its absolute origins. (IOG 170/152*t*)

But this dialectics would also, as I will show, require the inscription of the transcendental ego within a world, the transcendence of which remains to be interpreted.

> In fact, it is starting from the originary impression of time (and, on its foundation, of that of space) that, in the experience of the Living Present, there appears to me, the theoretical transcendental subject, the irreducible alterity of the moments of past and future time, retained and anticipated, from the surrounding [*envionnant*] world, from history, from 'egos.' (PG 240/148)

I wrote a moment ago that the *hylè*, as primarily temporal matter, operates as the possibility of genesis itself. In the *Cartesian Meditations*, Husserl presents time as "the universal form of all egological genesis." (Hua 1 §37) In *Experience and Judgment*, he posits time as the universal form of sensibility, or affection. (EU §38) The *hylè*, as the sensible matter of temporal affection, as the *ichfremde Kern*, for Husserl, designates "*the intrinsically first other* (the first 'non-Ego') [*as*] *the other Ego*. And the other Ego makes constitutionally possible a new infinite domain of what is 'other': an *Objective Nature* and a whole Objective world, to which all other Egos and I myself belong." (Hua 1 §49)

While static phenomenology had attempted the absolute bracketing of the objective world itself in what Husserl calls the *Epokhè*, genetic phenomenology inscribes the ego in time, with others and in the world. Neither the transcendental geneses of pre-predicative existence, the

Lebenswelt or lifeworld, primitive time nor those of transcendental intersubjectivity receive their sense from the action of an ego.[55] The possibility of the constitution of the other ego as such within consciousness permits consciousness to transcend itself towards the world and objectivity in general; the world must give itself "in its foreignness, in its alterity and its transcendence to consciousness." (PG 27/xxxvii*t*) Transcendental intersubjectivity, however, is only possible on the basis of a "single and common world." (PG 240/148*t*) The monadic ego is thus revealed as a secondary moment of a more originary, indeed for Derrida ontological constitution. For Husserl, the objective world is no longer transcendent to the sphere of intersubjectivity "but rather inheres in it as an 'immanent' transcendency." (Hua 1 §49) This common world brings together all monadic egos in the universal form of sensibility that is time. "From the intersubjective point of view, if another describes their past experiences to me, what is recalled in them belongs to the objective world of our common present. All the moments which we remember are moments of one and the same world: 'our earth.'" (PG 201/120*t)* Or, as Derrida puts it elsewhere, "the unity of the Earth is grounded in the unity and unicity of temporality, the 'fundamental form,' (*Grundform*) 'form of all forms.'" (IOG 79n1/83n86*e*)

§2.1.2: Teleology: Science, Translation, Earth and World in the Living Present

Having now studied the dialectic of the Living Present as it structures life in its relation to time, matter, others and now a world, 'nature,' the earth, let me pursue these latter questions with respect to those of scientific objectivity, history, teleology and translation. Derrida summarizes the problem of genesis as follows: "why must we always start from what is natural, constituted, derived, etc. to discover pure originarity only *in the end*?" (PG 139/75*t*) Or, relatedly, "how do 'transcendences' announce themselves *in* immanent lived experience?" (PG 143/78*t*) For Derrida, Husserl's genetic responses to these questions take three forms: the genesis of the ego in the *Cartesian Meditations*, the genesis of logic and science in *Experience and Judgement* and *Formal and Transcendental Logic* and finally, the genesis of teleology and history in the *Krisis* writings.[56] Of course, these are all interrelated; the common world, which functions as the possibility of intersubjectivity, also functions as the possibility of objectivity. Intersubjectivity and worldly objectivity concerning nature, space, time and causality also allow us to understand geometry, mathematics and physics in their exactness, as well as science and logic in general.[57] The crisis faced by the sciences for Husserl, however, is one of forgetting their origins in

subjective experience and the processes of their traditionalization, their becoming universally intelligible for everyone across history. The phenomenologist, as a functionary for humanity, is charged with the task of returning to these origins of science to explicate its infinite task and project. [58] This shift from a passive retention to an active reactivation, Derrida notes, foreshadowing the anthropocentrism I noted above, "is also that from inferior forms of nature and life to consciousness." (IOG 82n1/86n89*t*) From a mechanical reaction to a human response, one could say. The problem of genesis thus rephrased: how do the subjective experiences of the first geometer, scientist, philosopher, translator, become universally intelligible and eternal truths? How does the singular, finite, empirical, *de facto*, material and transcendent datum become a universal, infinite, transcendental, *de jure*, ideal and immanent truth?

It is in the Form of the Living Present that Derrida will formulate Husserl's responses to these questions with respect to the structure of ideal objects. Derrida explains that science, for Husserl, operates on two planes simultaneously. On the one hand, the truths of science are transmitted just as any other cultural truths in a movement analogous to the finite processes of protention and retention: their sedimentation in the communal world allows their transmission beyond their retention in finite, individual consciousnesses.[59] The Living Present thus functions as the foundation of the historical present. On the other hand, the truths of science are infinite, ideal and supratemporal. Regarding these two planes, "no doubt, the latter would *in fact* be impossible without the former. But on the one hand, the culture of truth is the highest and most irreducible possibility of empirical culture; on the other hand, the culture of truth is itself only the possibility of a *reduction* of empirical culture." (IOG 47-8/59) Later, Husserl distinguishes between real and ideal objects as follows: a real object exists in the objective time of the world, the transcendent time reduced in the *Lectures*, its truths bound to factical contingence. The ideal object, however, including the truths of geometry and mathematics, are intemporal or supratemporal; eternally and universally true. However, "'supratemporality' (*Überzeitlichkeit*) or 'intemporality' (*Zeitlosigkeit*) are defined in their transcendence or their negativity only *in relation* to worldly and factical temporality." (IOG 70n1/77n75*t*) The necessity of beginning with the natural, constituted and subjective experience of the discovery of mathematical truths is precisely so that it may be reduced, so that its truths may be freed from their factical contingency. After the reduction of worldly temporality, Derrida writes, supratemporality and

intemporality "appear as omnitemporality (*Allzeitlichkeit*), the concrete mode of temporality in general." (IOG 70n1/77n75) In other words, as the temporality of the Living Present:

> are not supratemporality and omnitemporality also the characteristics of *Time itself*? Those of the Living Present that is the absolute concrete Form of phenomenological temporality and the primordial Absolute of all transcendental life? The hidden temporal unity of the '*dia*-,' '*supra*-,' or '*in*-' temporality on the one hand and of *omni*-temporality on the other is the unitary ground of all the agencies dissociated by the various reductions: facticity and essentiality, worldliness and non-worldliness, reality and ideality, *empeiria* and transcendentality." (IOG 165/148-9*t*)

All these oppositions are dialectically reconciled in the Living Present. As I noted above, the importance of deconstruction vis-à-vis all the epistemological-ontological-ethical problems of translation, biopolitics, science and technology studies and ecolinguistics can be demonstrated in how Derrida comes to think the dialectics of the Living Present within the more general stricture I'm calling general ecology. These questions of earth and world are ones Derrida will put to Heidegger in his final seminar, *The Beast and the Sovereign*, and of the utmost importance for the posthumanist ecological ethics I am developing here: how do humans and other living beings share a world, share the earth? How can they do so more justly? There is an important sense in which the discussions of history, science and translation in Husserl's later work disclose a problematically humanist teleology. For Derrida, Husserl's use of the Idea in the Kantian sense always implies the self-presence of teleology to consciousness; it perhaps embodies the phenomenological project itself.[60] As he writes in *Voice and Phenomenon*, any time presence finds itself threatened, "Husserl will awaken it, will recall it, will make it return to itself in the form of the *telos*, that is, in the form of the Idea in the Kantian sense." (VP 8/8) It is through reference to the Idea in the Kantian sense as the infinite totality of temporal experiences in *Ideas I* (I'll call this Idea A), of the world as the infinite ground of possible experiences in *Experience and Judgment* (Idea B), and of an infinite teleology in *Cartesian Meditations* and the *Krisis* writings (Idea C) that I will show Derrida offer promising challenges to this humanism with reference to an originary finitude, indeed, to a death that can never be experienced as such but inscribes itself in the world.[61]

Idea A/*Die Welt ist fort*/The Infinite Totality of Temporal Lived Experiences of the Pure Ego

Despite being, for Derrida, the most elaborated trace of Husserl's static phenomenology, as well as its closest adherence to an absolute subjective idealism, certain structures in *Ideas I* already reveal the impossibility of phenomenology's closure.[62] I've shown how the role of the *hylè* in the originary bestowing intuition discloses a fundamental passivity anterior to the activity of the transcendental subject. Indeed, Derrida writes, the temporal *hylè*, as the originary existential kernel, is irreducible to Husserl's *epokhè*. The *epokhè* is nothing less than the absolute nullifying of the world itself, the 'suspension' of "the whole world with all things, living creatures, men, ourselves included."[63] (Hua 3 §50) This reduction intends to disclose a region of pure consciousness, absolutely immanent being, one that might well be modified in the annihilation of the world, for Husserl, but would not find its existence thereby affected.[64] The absolute transcendental ego in the *epokhè* is thus not only absolutely independent from the existence of the world, but also the earth for Derrida.[65] Absolute consciousness after the *epokhè* would oppose itself to the transcendent world as the indubitable, pure, originary and absolute to the doubtful, impure, constituted and relative.[66] How then, Derrida asks, can this absolute immanence, pure formalism and homogeneous unity of time therein be reconciled with the multiplicity of temporal experiences? Husserl here evokes the Idea in the Kantian sense as "the infinite opening of lived experience... the irruption of the infinite into consciousness, which permits the unification of the temporal flux of consciousness just as it unifies the object and the world by anticipation, and despite an irreducible incompleteness." (ED 242/204) In other words, the Idea is an "infinite totality of temporal experiences." (PG 39n1/187n12) For Derrida, Husserl's bringing together the flux of an absolute present with the Idea in the Kantian sense constitutes a vain attempt to "safeguard the immanent and monadic purity of the temporal ego." (PG 169/98) But of course, I have closely followed Derrida in showing that Husserl's own analyses of time, the other and the *hylè* are shown to compromise the purity of the ego within. In the passage to genetic phenomenology, the world will no longer be bracketed. Instead, it will itself function as an Idea in the Kantian sense, as the "infinite ground of possible experiences." (PG 39n1/187n12)

Idea B/*Die Welt ist da*/ The World as the Infinite Ground of Possible Experiences

Derrida identifies an ambiguity in Husserl's concept of world in *Experience and Judgement*. On the one hand, the world is "the universal ground of belief pregiven for every experience of individual objects," the passively pre-given and pre-predicative substrate of any transcendental activity, the always already constituted ontological, actual and real substrate of all sense.[67] (EU §7) On the other hand, the world is understood as the "horizon of all possible substrates of judgement." (EU §9) It is a possibility opened up to infinity, founding the worldliness it nonetheless exceeds. Husserl's concept of world thus opposes this infinite possibility of transcendental experiences to their actual, existing substrates. For Derrida, this ambiguity echoes that just examined in *Ideas I*, of the ego as both an originary 'now' and the infinite totality of possible lived experiences. Again, his point is that both the absolute realism of the pre-predicative world and its infinite idealization encounter the same aporetics. Let me recall that Derrida identifies two meanings of genesis: origin and becoming, transcendence and immanence. The ambiguity between the world as real and the world as possible renders these mutually exclusive.[68] Both movements prove contrary to the vocation of genetic phenomenology and must become mediated dialectically; both idealist and realist concepts of the world are thus revealed as already constituted. But, as with the *hylè*, "by making out of passivity the first moment of transcendental activity, a rigorous distinction between transcendental originarity and constituted worldliness is disallowed." (PG 193/114-5) As I'll show, this ambiguity will lend its rhythm to all my discussions in science and technology studies and translation studies. If the world is the real substrate of all scientific investigation and lived experience, then science and language adequately map the same world and translation is always in principle possible. By that same token, if the world is its ideal infinitization in the absolute idealism of the *epokhè*, then one might suggest all scientific investigation to be subjective and all language to be untranslatable. *That the terms are reversed in Husserl's work precisely illustrates my point*; it is only, on Derrida's reading of Husserl, in becoming ideal that an object frees itself from its factically contingent ground and becomes universally translatable.[69] In both cases, in the dialectic of the Living Present, pure realism comes down to pure idealism and pure translatability comes down to pure untranslatability.

Derrida ties these questions explicitly to language in the *Introduction*. The condition of possibility of ideal objects from the basis of the sensible, finite, and pre-scientific materials of

the lifeworld are identified as "language, intersubjectivity, and the world as the unity of ground and horizon." (IOG 3/26) As he explains, this return to pre-predicative experience in *Experience and Judgement* intends to disclose a pre-cultural and pre-historical dimension of experience. What assures the unity of sense in the traditionalization of ideal objects, he writes, is the world itself, "not as the finite totality of sentient beings, but as the infinite totality of possible experiences within a space in general." (IOG 38/52*t*) The ideal object obtains its omnitemporal value, universal normativity and infinite intelligibility through the possibility of language. However, this must be understood as language *in general*, one might say in the Pure Form of language, "not in the facticity of a language and in its particular linguistic incarnations." (IOG 57/66*t*) Nonetheless, a certain worldliness, a *materiality* of language will always pose a danger to transcendental discourse. Indeed, "every critical enterprise, juridical or transcendental, is made vulnerable by the irreducible facticity and the natural naiveté of its language."[70] (IOG 61n1/69-70n66) To return this to my question of temporality, universal language participates in the reduction of factical language in the universal intelligibility of ideal objects. Its supratemporality is then revealed as a mode of omnitemorality and infinite intelligibility in the dialectic of the Living Present. Freed from its attachment to factical contingency, Derrida writes, the possibility of tradition and *translation* is infinitely opened.[71] Language and thus also transcendental human intersubjectivity are revealed as the conditions of objectivity.[72]

> The language and consciousness of co-humanity are solidary possibilities and already given in the moment where the possibility of science is established. The horizon of co-humanity supposes the horizon of the world: it stands out and articulates its unity against the unity of the world. Of course, the world and co-humanity here designate the single, but infinitely open totality of possible experiences and not this world here, this co-humanity here... The consciousness of being-in-community within one and the same world grounds the possibility of a universal language. (IOG 73-4/79*t*)

Further, it is the question of time as the form of sensibility that structures intersubjectivity in the understanding of being before one and the same world. As Husserl writes, "the world is, in the most comprehensive sense, as the *life-world* for a human community capable of mutual understanding, *our earth*, which includes within itself all these different environing worlds with their modifications and their pasts." (EU §38) As Derrida puts it, the unity of the Earth is grounded in the unicity of temporality, the fundamental form of all forms, as I showed above.[73] It is the earth itself, as the absolutely exemplary element that provides the ground of a consciousness of "a pure and pre-cultural *we,*" a consciousness of belonging to "one and the

same humanity, inhabiting one and the same world." (IOG 76/81*t*) However, he adds, "pre-cultural *pure Nature* is always already buried. So, as the ultimate possibility for communication, it is a kind of inaccessible infra-ideal."[74] (IOG 77/81-2) An originary finitude would then mark the infinite traditionalization and translatability of ideal objectivity from within. Indeed, Derrida recalls here that we lack all names for the conjunction of absolute subjectivity and the flux constituting internal time consciousness and that Husserl also proclaims that proto- or pre-temporality (*Vorzeit*) is not 'sayable' for the transcendental ego.[75] The same debate repeats itself in a fascinating comparison of Joyce and Husserl on the question of univocity and equivocity. As Derrida puts it, "absolute univocity is inaccessible, but only as an Idea in the Kantian sense can be." (IOG 107/104) As an infinite task, Husserl puts forth universal language as the very condition of historicity, as well as of all the equivocations proceeding from empirical culture and history.[76] Univocity, in this sense, is an imperative, one the phenomenologist, as the functionary for humanity, must take on.

Idea C/*Ich muss dich tragen*/ The Teleological-Historical Idea

Certain ethico-political implications result from this. Derrida ties together what one might call Husserl's fort/da of the Earth as follows:

> there is indeed a single world and this world is what appears to the transcendental ego precisely there where there is no longer any existing world. The world, worlds, the plurality of cultures, all of those are one only in their capacity to disappear, *in fact*, *in reality*, *empirically*, without the universal ego ceasing to be able to appear to itself. (FP 24*t*)

For Derrida, the cultural and empirical facticity of language would instil an originary finitude at the heart of the absolute univocity and universal transmissibility of ideal objects. However, if this finitude were shown to disclose the forgetting of the transcendental origins of science not as accidental, but as a moment in the dialectic of the Living Present itself, the project of phenomenology could thus be saved. It is again through recourse to an Idea in the Kantian sense that Husserl will attempt this move in evoking the teleology of history as an infinite task and responsibility. As Derrida explains, the concept of teleology has deep roots in Husserl's philosophy, linking together the three Ideas I am examining here.[77] For Husserl, the sedimentation of the origins of techno-scientific objectivity corresponds to the dialectic of

protention and retention in the Living Present.[78] The process of reactivating these sedimented origins overcomes this finitude,

> and lets it go beyond itself; this movement is analogous to the constitution, for example, of the unity of the world's infinite horizon or (beyond the finite interconnection of retentions and protentions) to the constitution of the evidence for a total unity of the immanent flux as an Idea in the Kantian sense. But above all, this movement is analogous to the production of geometry's exactitude: this passage to the infinite limit of a finite and qualitative sensible intuition. (IOG 109/106)

For Husserl, the infinite teleological idea is one that would have irrupted upon Greek Europe with the advent of philosophy and geometry. And, Derrida recalls, "these ruptures... are always already indicated, Husserl recognizes, 'in confusion and in the dark,' that is, not only in the most elementary forms of life and of human history, but closer and closer in animality and nature in general." (ED 248/208)

> the night that engulfs the '*arche-premises*'... not only hides the fact but also the instituting sense... the '*critical*' forgetting of origins [is] the faithful shadow in truth's advance rather than accidental aberration. This distinction between fact and sense (or the *de facto* and the *de jure*) would be effaced in the sense-investigation [*prise de conscience*] of an originary finitude. (IOG 108/105*t*)

But again, this conjunction of facticity and normativity only occurs after the reduction of the passively given empirical, contingent, transcendent finitude that thus reveals its transcendental, universal, immanent and infinite task and goal. In this indissociability of fact and norm, history and the infinite, it is essential to note that normativity and the infinite are *nothing* outside the fact and history within which they appear.[79]

> Undoubtedly the Idea and the Reason hidden in history and in man as *'animal rationale'* are eternal. Husserl often says this. But this eternity is *only* a historicity. It is the *possibility* of history itself. Its supratemporality – compared with empirical temporality – is only an omnitemporality. The Idea, like Reason, is *nothing* outside the history in which it *exposes* itself, i.e., in which (in one and the same movement) it unveils itself and lets itself be threatened. (IOG 156/141-2)

The same can be said of the task or duty of phenomenology itself.[80] As Derrida writes, the always-already of the ethico-teleological prescription of the infinite task "is grounded, then, in the movement of originary phenomenological temporalization, in which the Living Present of consciousness holds itself as the primordial Absolute only in an indefinite protention, animated and unified by the Idea (*in the Kantian sense*) of the total flux of lived experience." (IOG 148-9/136*t*) The 'after' in this structure in no way implies a dependence of the ethical on the factical:

the sedimentation of sense must be understood in the dialectic of the Living Present as the movement that allows the infinite Idea, always already there, to be born to itself.[81] Responsibility in this case is one of a reactivation before the passive sedimentation of sense, one from passivity to activity, from inferior forms of life and nature to consciousness, from reaction to response.[82] The irruption of the infinite idea onto Europe marks a new stage in humanity, for Husserl, of which he identifies three. First, what Husserl calls 'pre-theoretical culture,' history in the most universal sense for Derrida, common to every society, which itself constitutes a new stage of animality in opposition to the beast.[83] It is at this first level that the infinite task of reason slumbers in non-historicity, confusion and darkness. Without this stage, however, the irruption of the infinite task upon Europe could not arise as it does in the second level, the Greco-European moment of the theoretical or philosophical project. Phenomenological science stands as the third stage in this structure. The Crisis faced by the sciences "only finds full achievement in phenomenology – the achievement of a Telos that burst upon Europe with the advent of Greek geometry and gave its meaning to Europe's spiritual figure. Europe is not a politico-geographical aggregate, but the unity of a responsibility for a task, a project." (PCM 83/117) As the 'functionary for humanity,' Derrida writes, the phenomenologist is charged with reawakening the unity of this task in order to "found and save the unity of mankind." (PCM 84/118) The historical present, founded on the Living Present, thus functions as the condition of possibility of the production of infinitely transmissible and translatable truths: the possibility for every culture to open itself to the infinite.[84] In the historical present,

> irreducible form of every historical experience... I can always come to terms in this Present with the most distant, the most different *'other*.' However foreign to each other two men may be, they are always understandable – at the limit – in the commonality of their Living Present in which the historic Present is rooted. (IOG 114-5/110)

No matter the material, traditional, social, linguistic or any other factical contingency,

> this in no way affects the commonality of their form. This universal form, which is the most *originary* and concrete lived experience, is supposed by all being-together. This form also seems to be the final retrenchment, therefore the most *responsible* security, of every phenomenological reduction. In the ultimate *juridical instant* [instance] is announced the most radical unity of the world. (IOG 115/110-1)

Both *The Problem of Genesis* and the *Introduction* conclude with the necessity of an articulation between phenomenology and the insights of Heideggerean ontology. In the latter text, Derrida defines the auto-affection of the Living Present as the transcendental, indeed

ontological difference at its heart, between activity and passivity, the *de facto* and the *de jure,* the same and the other, the transcendental and the empirical, etc. For both Heidegger and Husserl, he writes, appearing and dissimulation are originary and complicit possibilities.[85] The metaphysical forgetting of the ontological difference is not a fault, but an epoch in the history of Being. Similarly, the crisis of forgetting origins indeed founds the possibility of phenomenology's role in the final stage of the history of Reason's unconcealment. The question of genesis, Derrida writes, "is to ask the question about the unity of the world from which transcendental freedom releases itself, in order to make the origin of this unity appear." (ED 251/210)

> It is the question of the possibility of the question, opening itself, the gap on whose basis the *transcendental I*, which Husserl was tempted to call 'eternal' (which in his thought, in any event, means neither infinite nor ahistorical, quite the contrary) is called upon to ask itself about everything, and particularly about the possibility of the unformed and naked factuality of *non-sense*, in the case, for example, of its own death. (ED 251/210-1)

The question, perhaps the question of Being, founds the possibility of the concept of world while exposing it to non-sense and death. It is not my intention here to present Derrida's readings of Husserl as outlining an exclusively anthropocentric, ethno- and Eurocentric, idealist philosophy, one committed to the erasure of all differences between humans, between their cultures and languages, and in the same blow carving out uncrossable lines between the human and other living beings, a philosophy centered on the activity of the individual, monadic and non-relational subject, in short everything one would imagine environmental ethics and general ecology to problematize. In fact, as I will argue in chapter 3, many of these criticisms are those that Heidegger levels against Husserl. General ecology does not *oppose* the logic of the Living Present, since this move would itself be dialectical; it articulates its logic within a more general stricture. Despite an important shift in emphasis in Derrida's later readings of Husserl, the questions of temporalization, alterity, the *hylè* and even of the Idea itself all maintain their importance, as they contest phenomenology in its principle of principles and can never be given *as such* in an intuition. While it is in Derrida's reading of Heidegger that I will tie together the *as such*, the question of Being, the ontological difference and the question of sharing a world with other living beings more directly, two points may be held in anticipation. 1) While Heidegger's restriction of the 'as such' to the human Dasein cleaves an abyss between the world it inhabits and that of other living beings, the same is in fact true in Husserl. Both Husserl and Heidegger think the world on "a horizon of precomprehension, a presumption of unity, a presupposition of

coherence, belonging, the *logos* or the *legein* of a gathering, a horizon from which or on the grounds of which everything that arrives *arrives as such*." (FP 26*t*) The consciousness of a pure and pre-cultural 'we' assuring universal translatability rests on the consciousness of being before the same object 'as such.' As Derrida elaborates, "it is the 'as such' of the object's substantial and objective unity which is decisive here. In particular it distinguishes human intersubjectivity from that which is created between animals, men and animals, children, etc." (IOG 76n1/81n84) It is precisely along this question of sharing a world with animals that Derrida famously evokes Celan's line "*die Welt ist fort ich muss dich tragen*" [the world is gone away, I must carry you] in relation to Heidegger. Derrida writes that while on the one hand, humans and animals share a world and on the other do not, not a single living being shares the same world as another. In fact, Derrida also evokes this line of Celan's in relation to the *Epokhè*. "In this absolute solitude of the pure *ego*, when the world has retreated, when '*die Welt ist fort*,' the *alter ego* that is constituted in the *ego* is no longer accessible in an originary and purely phenomenological intuition." (SQ 161) In the absence of a common world, ethics and responsibility come down "*to carry oneself or bear oneself toward* [se porter vers] the infinite inappropriability of the other, toward the encounter with its absolute transcendence, in the very inside of me, that is to say, in me outside of me" (SQ 161); to comport oneself "*as if* we were behaving *as if* we were inhabiting the same world and speaking of the same thing and speaking the same language, when in fact we well know – at the point the phantasm precisely comes up against its limit – that this is not true at all." (BS2 369/268) The ethics of Celan's poem, Derrida writes,

> signals toward an alterity that, in the inside of the 'I' as the punctual living present, as the very point of the self-present living present, an alterity of the wholly other, comes not to include and modalize another living present (as in the Husserlian analysis of temporalization, where, in the protention and retention of another living present in the now living present, the ego comprises in itself, in its present, another present), [this is what I'm calling restricted ecology] but – *and this is a wholly other matter* – lets appear something of the present *of the other*, this 'letting the most proper of the time of the other.'[86] (SQ 131*e*)

But to act 'as if' we shared the same world is itself a regulative idea of reason.[87] Derrida goes as far as to conjugate the Idea of the '*als ob'* with the Heideggerian '*als struktur*' – the structure through which only the human Dasein has access to the world *as such* – into an *Alsobstruktur*. Both the world as a regulative Idea of reason and that to which Dasein, as world-forming, has access *as such,* are the exclusive property of the human. Instead, Derrida wishes to think this

'regulative' carrying in the context of a Nietzschean perspectivism, indeed *as a machinic ruse of life death*; "an agreement, then, an always labile, arbitrary, conventional and artificial, historical, non-natural contract, to ensure for oneself the best, and therefore also the longest *survival* by a system of life insurances." [88] (BS2 368/267) A wholly other matter, a matter of the wholly other; this letting and carrying assuring survival, to say it quickly, is impossible in the restricted ecology of phenomenology, and indeed ontology, I'll show in chapter 3. This is why Derrida explains Bataille's transgression of sense as the contrary of a phenomenological *epokhè*, whose reduction operates in a concern for sense.[89] Bataille proposes an *epokhè* of the epoch of sense; "sovereign transgression is a reduction of this reduction: not a reduction to meaning, but a reduction of meaning," an untranslatability exceeding the dialectics of Husserlian phenomenology as it does that of the phenomenology of spirit. (ED 393-4/339) General ecology will allow us to think the impossibility of this *letting* otherwise, perhaps, even experience it, but in a strange experience *without* experience, an experience without *Erlebnis*, the 'unexperienced' experience of the impossible I spoke of in Bataille and Blanchot's *pas de sens*. 2) My second point relates this question of the 'as such' to that of death. Again, Heidegger will write that only humans have access to death as such. But death for Derrida can never give itself as such in the phenomenological principle of principles, in the Form of the Living Present.

> The theme of death, but of a death that never appears as such, perhaps precisely marks the limit of the phenomenological project. One must say... that Husserl's transcendental phenomenology is a philosophy of life, of the living present, I wouldn't say a vitalism. Nonetheless, Husserl constantly connects the notion of life to the experience of a consciousness : the ego is a living ego, and in a certain way death has no place within phenomenology as such. (SP 81*t*)

§2.2: Tra(nscenden)ce: Death, Ethics and Violence in the Living Present

One can read Derrida's "Violence and Metaphysics" as opening an ethical reinterpretation of the Living Present through the logic of what Derrida and Levinas call the trace. Over three decades later, Derrida would reflect on Levinas's ethics as the interruption of phenomenology, its beyond-within, its transcendence in immanence.[90] Recalling that the Living Present designates an articulation between a philosophy of life and a metaphysics of presence, it can be understood as the Greek philosophical concept par excellence for Derrida. Through Levinas, however, Derrida pursues an-other origin of the philosophical question, one which would not simply oppose itself to or contradict the latter, within which "'neither no nor yes is the first word' but an

interrogation... the only possible ethical imperative, the only incarnated nonviolence in that it is respect for the other."[91] (ED 142/119) Husserlian teleology had identified the phenomenologist as a functionary for humanity, taking on the task of a *logos* that had irrupted upon the human and laid dormant in animality and more elementary forms of life. Levinas, for Derrida, points to another anterior, absolute, indeed pre-historical origin of this philosophical task, otherwise than Greek and, for my purposes, otherwise-than-human. Levinas refers us to an ethical origin of the question outside what he calls the Greek dominance of the totality of the same, an *ethics* as "a nonviolent relationship to the infinite as infinitely other, to the Other as the only one capable of opening the space of transcendence." (ED 123/102) This ethical transcendence is posed as impossible, as *the* impossible within the Living Present, and thus the mark of an unassumable responsibility, one within which I am powerless before the philosophical invulnerability of the Living Present.[92] What Derrida and Levinas will develop in the trace, however, will allow one to think this powerlessness and impossibility otherwise. But the thrust of Derrida's argument in this essay is that Levinas will always be obligated to speak of this impossible ethical transcendence from the Living Present through the *language* of totality. In other words, the ethical experience of the impossible must necessarily maintain itself through some relation to possibility, even some relation to transcendental phenomenological violence. It is in this sense that one can interpret Derrida's thought of the trace and an ethical relation to alterity as 'a certain absence' within the Living Present, beyond the opposition of presence and absence.[93] This absence and its ethical import, however, would not come to mark the Living Present as its pure exteriority, but work at it from within as its ineradicable relation to death and its sur-vivance.

In a sense, "Violence and Metaphysics" can be read as an attempt by Derrida to articulate the quasi-dialectical complications of the Living Present in *The Problem of Genesis* and the *Introduction* with the Levinasian thought of the trace, as one between, as he puts it almost forty years later,

> *on the one hand*, my other living present (retained or anticipated by an indispensible movement of retention and protention), [this is what I'm calling restricted ecology] and, *on the other hand,* wholly other, the present of the other the temporality of which cannot be reduced, included, assimilated, introjected, appropriated into mine, cannot even resemble it or be similar to it.[94] (BS1 364/271-2)

Levinas's own philosophical project begins with an analysis of Husserl, and I showed for Derrida a critique of the absolute privilege of the Living Present.[95] Levinas will have always

sought to oppose the ethical spirit he sees in Husserl's descriptions of intentionality, temporalization and passive genesis to its letter in the Husserlian corpus. All of these movements, for Levinas, lead before and beyond the subject-object and noetico-noematic correlations to the dimension of the ethical relation to the other. I noted earlier how the relations to time and the other would refer phenomenology to a pre-subjective transcendental field for Derrida. Levinas similarly describes a "preobjective sphere of an intentional experience absolutely departing from itself towards the other." (ED 128/399n14) In other words, both Derrida and Levinas refer to a space of ethical relationality that transcends the subject-object correlation, the immanence of the transcendental and the empirical.[96] In Derrida, I interpreted the space of this ethical relationality as ecological, where it was impossible to determine in advance whether the other interpellating me was human, animal, fungal, vegetal, bacterial, viral, living or dead, God or a nonliving material thing. Such is, for Derrida, the condition of ethics: "the unrecognizable... is the beginning of ethics, and not of the human. So long as there is recognizability and fellow, ethics is dormant. So long as it remains human, among men, ethics remains dogmatic, narcissistic, and not yet thinking."[97] (BS1 155/108)

And here a point of differentiation from Levinas arises: for Derrida and Husserl, the transcendence of the real, finite, material, natural things of the external world are those of an irreducible alterity for my consciousness, while Levinas cannot abide a thought of the infinite other as a thing (or as an animal, let alone a plant). As Derrida explains, Husserl in fact develops a system of two alterities inscribed one within the other, that of the thing, and that of alterity in general.[98] Husserl argues that analogical appresentation – the structure by which I recognize the other as another source of 'I can's' distinct from myself by way of analogy – belongs to all perception, but the alterity of the transcendent thing is only due to the "indefinite inachievements of my originary perceptions," while the other testifies to "a more profound dimension of nonoriginarity – the radical impossibility of going around to see things from the other side." (ED 183/155) For Derrida, the transcendence of the other can only be thought on the basis of the transcendence of the thing. One must think together the system, indeed stricture of these two alterities, these two transcendences from the Living Present, on the one hand below in the finite totality of thing, and on the other, beyond in an infinite alterity. This entanglement is required in order to think the double indefiniteness and unknowability of the infinitely other, the transcendence of the non-proper as the "transcendence of *Infinity*, not of *Totality*."[99] (ED

183/155) This double stricture of transcendence, detailing an originary finitude as the condition of possibility of the infinite, can be read as heralding Derrida's later reflection on Levinas in *Adieu* and *The Gift of Death*: '*tout autre est tout autre*,' every other (one) is every (bit) other, and the fact that I can never know in advance to what transcendence I am responding in no way diminishes ethical responsibility, but stands as its very condition of possibility, its violent opening.

> Each of us, every one else, each other is infinitely other in its absolute singularity, inaccessible, solitary, transcendent, nonmanifest, originarily nonpresent to my *ego* (as Husserl would say of the *alter ego* that can never be originarily presented to my conscience and that I can apprehend only through what he calls *appresentation* and analogy), then what can be said about Abraham's relation to God can be said about my relation without relation to *every other (one) as every (bit) other* [*tout autre comme tout autre*] in particular my relation to my neighbour or my loved ones who are as inaccessible to me, as secret, and as transcendent as Yahweh. Every other (in the sense of each other) is wholly other (absolutely other). (DM 109-10/78)

This structure of every other (one) as every (bit) other would thoroughly overwhelm the phenomenological principle of principles in the Living Present. As Derrida puts it in *The Politics of Friendship*, its logic "comes here to upset the order of phenomenology. And good *sense*. That which comes before autonomy must *exceed it* – that is, succeed it, survive and indefinitely overwhelm it." (PA 259/232) Levinas understands phenomenology as a philosophy of violence, and the key disagreement between him and Husserl lies in the latter's account of the transcendental constitution of the alter ego. Because of the necessity of passing through the transcendence of a finite material alterity to encounter the infinite alterity of the other, Husserl cannot respect the other *as such*. The structure of analogical appresentation can only do violence to the trace of the invisible transcendence of the other, and reduces the infinite alterity of the other to the same. Further, phenomenology's inability to think the other also entails its inability to think time and history: the absolute alterity of instants comes into time through the other and cannot be subjectively constituted.[100] Levinas describes here an anteriority of alterity over temporality, one Derrida would complicate in his own evaluations of the trace and différance.[101] It is precisely this co-implication of time and alterity for every living being that for Derrida contests the absolute privilege given to the self-evidence of the Living Present. What I'm trying to describe as the double auto-transcendence of the Living Present, both as its finite materiality and its infinite alterity constitutes precisely the system or stricture of this im-possible ethical

relationality. History, Derrida writes, is impossible within both finite totality and positive infinity, in the same sense as I showed him refer to the infinite finitude of différance in chapter 1. General ecology might be another name for this stricture between the restricted ecology of finite totality and absolute, impossible positive infinity. In maintaining itself within the difference between totality and infinity, ecology may be "precisely what Levinas calls transcendence... neither finite nor infinite." (ED 180/153)

As Derrida writes, it is *impossible* to immediately encounter the alter ego in the sense Levinas demands, just as we are powerless to exit the invulnerable Living Present. If pure alterity did not present itself through some differing and deferring relation to the same, however, its absolute otherness would come down to absolute sameness. He goes on to point out that Husserl is at pains to show how the other does in fact present itself as such to me in its irreducible alterity as an originary non-presence, but this 'as such' *to me* is the only possible as such. He thus aims to demonstrate the intentional relation to the other as irreducibly *mediate*.[102] The other can never be given to me originarily, only through analogical apposition, and the double transcendence of this finite/infinite system permits the *only possible* encounter or experience of this impossibility. This non-dialectical mediation maintains the necessity of an ethical separation, indeed a necessary violence which would guard the infinity of the other from presenting itself *absolutely* and *immediately*, where its infinity would come down to pure death. It thus guards against the world of immortality, against the pure and worst violence of the absolute life and pure self-presence of the Living Present by inscribing it originarily with death.[103]

The arche-factuality of the Living Present, Derrida writes, constitutes the irreducible and absolutely universal form of egological life. To live an experience otherwise than in the present, I mentioned, is an absolute and eternal impossibility, unthinkability and unsayability. And yet, "Violence and Metaphysics" opens with the claim that the impossible has already occurred; what Derrida is beginning to formulate as the trace-structure of the Living Present will suggest that its general ecological stricture, in its transcendence in temporalization and alterity, maintains itself through a certain relation to and experience of an impossible past which has never been present. Since time designates the necessity that the other appear as other to the same, time is violence for Derrida. But this violence is in fact the very condition of the least possible violence: as the absolute opening to time and the other within itself, "the present, the presence of the present, and

the present of presence are originarily and forever violent. The Living Present is originarily marked by death." (ED 195/166*t*) And, as I've shown, this death, violence and finitude within the Living Present are themselves the very condition of possibility of ethics, or at least the only possible ethics. The only *possible* ethics: an economy of violence.

In elaborating the ethics of general ecology, it is essential to recall Derrida's gradual abandonment of what he will later call the restricted economy of dialectics, or its articulation within an-other economy, an 'economy in a new sense,' or even a 'trans-economy.'[104] The following will thus necessitate an interrogation of Levinas's non-negative, that is, non-dialectical transcendence. As Derrida explains, Levinas understands ethical transcendence in contrast to Hegel and the movement of negation. For the latter, just as Husserlian consciousness cannot give itself time and the absolute alterity of instants without the irruption of the wholly other, and the ego cannot engender within itself the encounter of the other, the negative cannot think the relation to and separation from the other within transcendence. The ethical encounter for Levinas is a relation that announces itself as a rupture within economy, a separation towards the other without any hope of possibly returning to the same. The encounter of the other as unforeseeable, Derrida adds, is "the only possible opening of time, the only pure future, the only *pure expenditure* beyond history as economy." (ED 142/118*e*) Levinas's understanding of the trace is precisely a 'transcendence beyond negativity,' a beyond of economy, history and dialectics, but also a beyond and a future which is "not another time, a day after history, a tomorrow of history. It is everywhere at the heart of experience. Present not as a total presence but as a *trace*." (ED 142/118-9) This non-negative transcendence of the trace would thus constitute the immediate and non-violent respect of the other. In a sense, Derrida's adoption of the Levinasian trace as a past that has never been present, as the alterity of the other, can be understood as detailing the necessity of the inscription of the trace within the Living Present, and perhaps even in the finite materiality of the earth, as its condition of possibility, the impossible inscription of the relation that goes beyond the world within immanence.[105] This inscription returns us to the question of language and writing broached in the *Introduction*: the violence of this inscription opens the relation to the infinitely other as death and as dead within the Living Present, "thus practicing writing as *différance* and as an *economy of death*."[106] (ED 151/127)

The necessary violence of "language, son of earth and sun, writing," of originary finitude and death will be shown to constitute the very condition of possibility of ethics within general

ecology. (ED 166/140) In his pursuit of another origin of the question, where the only ethical imperative as non-violence would be an interrogation anterior to the yes and the no, Levinas is nonetheless obligated to speak of this ethical tra(nscenden)ce in the language of the negative, of finitude, of totality and of death.[107] "One must state the *excess* of infinity over totality *in* the language of totality, one must say the Other in the language of the Same." (ED 165/140*t*) One must say the relations transcending the opposition of inside and outside – "*the relation to the other, the relation of Instants to one another, the relation to Death*" (ED 165/139*t*,*e*) – within this very opposition, within the Living Present; once again the logics of the beyond-within and of the *pas au-delà* I discussed in chapter 1. The infinite alterity of the other is made possible by its mortality and finitude, as well as my own, within "the irreducibly *common* horizon of Death and the Other. Horizon of finitude of the finitude of the horizon." (ED 170/144) This finitude of the horizon will force an entire rethinking of the Kantian teleology that dominates the restricted ecology of the Living Present. One must, in the language of life and the Living Present, say its excess as the transcendence of the *sur-* in survivance. This enables the articulation of the relation to the infinitely other as death, as the corporeal finitude of the face, and to the infinitely other as God, the logic by which Derrida would write "tout autre est tout autre," decades later. The pure infinite living presence of God thus really means death, unless the alterity of death, which in advance forbids one from knowing the singularity to which one is always already responding, human, animal, vegetal, fungal, bacterial, viral or inorganic, technological or machinic, linguistic or cultural, appears, is named and inscribed "in the difference between... Life and death. Within difference, and at bottom as Difference itself."[108] (ED 170/144) Since nothing escapes this inscription in the différance between life and death, in the originarity of survivance and life death, the alterity therein can be anything whatsoever.

There is a sense in which ecological ethics can be thought to practice "the lesser violence in an *economy of violence*," within and through the ecology of the Living Present, within and from the Greek origin of the question, the metaphysics of presence and the philosophy of life. (ED 136n1/400n21) Violence against violence in an economy of violence, one that takes finitude and history seriously in its vigilance against the worst possible violence. "*We do not say absolutely peaceful*. We say *economical*. There is a transcendental violence, a (general) dissymmetry whose archia is the same and which eventually permits the inverse dissymmetry, the ethical nonviolence of which Levinas speaks." (ED 188/160) This transcendental violence

installs the ethical relation precisely through finitude and mortality. The economy of transcendental violence is thus another name for différance, on the one hand the restricted ecology of violence against violence, and through this, the non-violent opening of the relation to the other. However, if Levinasian transcendence remains exclusively and properly conferred upon the human, it is insufficient for my purposes here.[109] In opening the restricted ecology of the Living Present to its absolute other, however, to the impossible beyond of economy, the question, history and philosophy, Levinas's thought allows us to think together an economy, indeed a necessary ecology of violence, and that which at the same time exceeds all economy, or any propriative thought of *oikos*. In the same sense, it points beyond violence, force, power and sovereignty, disclosing environmental ethics and biocultural sustainability in their concern for letting the other live-on. Derrida's reading of Levinas clarifies the ethical stakes of the relations to time, alterity, death and materiality transcending the Living Present precisely as the impossibility of knowing to what, in the quasi-infinitely complicated originary ecological relationality of the pre-subjective transcendental field, one has always already begun to respond, has addressed and done violence to in this address, as the necessity of a critical vigilance in maintaining the infinite alterity of the finite "every other (one) as every (bit) other... whatever it may be, X, the animal, God or man." (FP 6*t*) Articulating the restricted ecology of the Living Present within a general stricture, exposing it originarily as its auto-affection and self-relation to its ecological, ethical tra(nscenden)ce.

§2.3: The Arche-Writing of Ecological Relationality

I began this chapter by bringing together three later remarks of Derrida's on the Living Present and their relevance for the ethics of ecological relationality I am attempting to develop here. The first, from *The Animal...*, where he admits that at the heart of his reflections on life before and beyond what calls itself the human are the problematizations of the Living Present with which his work began. The second, from *Spectres of Marx,* where he writes that no ethics is possible without the disjunction and non-self-contemporaneity of the Living Present, and the third, from "Eating Well," that the passive geneses of temporalization and intersubjectivity constitute an effraction of the Living Present and lead back to a 'pre-egological or pre-subjectivist zone,' one where the subject appears as relationally (I said ecologically) constituted, but can never in advance know the nature of this relationality, pluralizing and complicating the distinctions

between "the nonliving, the vegetal, the animal, man, or God." (PDS 284/269) This impossibility of knowing in advance the addressee/s to which one has always already begun to live with, respond to and be responsible for was shown to constitute the difficult structure of an originary violence as the non-ethical opening of ethics. This last section will attempt to flesh out the ecological structure of this pre-subjective transcendental field. I'll begin in §2.3.1 by showing how the transcendences of time, alterity and death structure subjectivity, life and organic auto-affection in their relation to what Derrida calls arche-writing. In §2.3.2, I'll detail the ecological imperative general ecology gives to be thought in differentially sharing the world with its others, in a living-on beyond the Living Present.

§2.3.1: The Living-Dead Present

As I have shown, the Living Present conjoins pure life and absolute subjectivity, functions as the universal and absolute form of all transcendental experience, source and guarantor of the full presence of the givenness of intuition to consciousness, presence of sense to intuition and the infinite possibility of the repetition of this sense in ideality. It is for Derrida what structures consciousness and indeed subjective existence in general as the self-presence of transcendental life. [110] Despite Husserl's analyses of passive genesis, intentional consciousness remains synonymous with volitional consciousness, and phenomenology thus remains within the tradition of voluntaristic metaphysics; metaphysics itself, for Derrida, of which the Living Present is the founding concept.[111] Denoting both the pure livingness of presence and the pure self-presence of life, phenomenology for Derrida would ultimately come down to "a philosophy of *life*." (VP 9/9) Even when phenomenology brackets empirical life, one is still lead back to "a transcendental *life* or in the last instance the transcendentality of a *living* present." (VP 9/9) In the metaphysics of living presence and presencing life, the absolute temporal and spatial self-proximity of the life of the present and the presence of life maintains this pure self-presence precisely by putting out of play the exteriorities or transcendences of time, alterity, materiality and death. However, Derrida again reminds us that phenomenology finds itself contested from within in its descriptions of temporalization and intersubjectivity, leading back to a constituting and irreducible non-presence, non-life and non-originarity at the heart of the Living Present.[112] Against the mutual immanence of empirical and transcendental life, and with it the notion of death as a mere empirical accident befalling life, Derrida attempts to formulate an "ultra-transcendental concept

of life," which "welds the transcendental to its other." (VP 14/13, 14/12) In other words, binds it to what transcends the transcendental field of the Living Present of consciousness, its outside, its other in a stricture designating an originary ecological relationality where every other (one) is every (bit) other.[113]

However, to treat separately the relations of transcending the living present and the self-presence of the transcendental subject (temporalization, alterity and intersubjectivity, materiality, space, the outside and death) poses some important difficulties, given that in the end, these all really come down to the same for transcendental idealism.[114] Indeed, every description of temporalization in Husserl that would not contest the Living Present would confirm the belonging of phenomenology to metaphysics.[115] In Derrida's formulations of différance and the trace, however, the movements of temporalization and intersubjectivity appear at first to have a certain privilege.[116] What Derrida calls their irreducible complicity comes to designate precisely the differantial or trace-structure of the Living Present, its non-presence to itself.[117] As covered in Derrida's analysis of Husserl's *Lectures*..., the presence of the Living Present maintains itself continuously through the retention and memory of a past now and the protention or anticipation of a future now. In other words, Derrida writes, the flux of the Living Present constitutes itself in relation with a non-present, a not-now and indeed an alterity within its self-identity as the very condition of its presence. This is, one might say, the restricted pole of the stricture of two transcendences, different from the alterity of the past that has never been present and of the future-to-come. In this sense, and very similarly to Derrida's dialectical explanation in 1954, time must be thought "beginning from the différance in auto-affection, beginning from the identity of identity and non-identity in the same." (VP 77/59) Indeed, he adds, "this 'dialectic' – in all the senses of this word and prior to every speculative resumption of this concept" opens every living to différance and constitutes "in the pure immanence of lived experience," the very transcendences Husserl attempts to bracket in the phenomenological reduction. (VP 77/59) Différance in this sense is not something that supervenes upon the self-relation of a transcendental subject, but rather produces the subject in its difference with itself.[118] As with Derrida's discussion of Levinas, the same does not come down to the identical, but rather constitutes the only possible experience of alterity as its own condition of impossibility. But this apparently still dialectical complication of the Living Present is more clearly abandoned once and for all in *Of Grammatology*, or rather rearticulated within a more general stricture. The

necessity that temporal experience minimally retain the other as other within the same is again presented as the condition of all phenomenality, but its retention as trace is expressed as a "temporalization of a *lived experience* [vécu] which is neither *in* the world nor in 'another world,'" in other words, in relation to a past which has never been present.[119] (DG 95/65) As he notes, the past and future have always and only ever been thought as modifications of the present; past-present and future-present. To deconstruct the Living Present for Derrida does not come down to "a 'dialectic' of protention and retention that one would install at the heart of the present." (DG 97/67) It is not a question of merely showing that present-past and present-future constitute and divide the Living Present. As he claims, *Husserl had already done this himself*. To affirm an equal and therefore dialectical importance to protention in relation to retention, however, would risk effacing the radical passivity of time.[120] The Living Present can only maintain itself in relation to an absolute past, one that "no longer rigorously merits the name 'past,'" a radical passivity that is paradoxically also a relation to the future. (DG 97/66) Derrida again credits Levinas with this notion.[121] In "Différance," he will reject the concept of retention altogether in describing the trace-structure of the Living Present. As this relation to an immemorial past, to an alterity that cannot be reproduced within the self-presence of consciousness,

> with the alterity of the 'unconscious,' we are dealing not with horizons of – past or future – modified presents, but with a 'past' that has never been present and never will be, whose 'future-to-come' [*à-venir*] will never be a *production* or a reproduction in the form of presence. The concept of trace is thus incommensurable with that of retention, the becoming-past of what has been present.[122] (MP 22/21*t*)

Keeping in mind the systematic solidarity of consciousness, subjectivity and voluntarism, allow me to pursue the pre-subjective implications of the temporalization of the trace and their 'ecological' inscription into matter, 'nature' and the earth. As I showed, the thought of the trace can neither break with nor be reduced to transcendental phenomenology for Derrida. While I noted that immanent time consciousness is transcended in the Living Present both in the originary hyletic impression and in the constituting flux for which we lack names, Derrida now writes that "it is no accident if [Husserl] still designates this unnameable as 'absolute subjectivity.'" (VP 94n1/72n)

What is unnameable in the constituting flux of the Living Present is not a present being, self-present or self-identical, etc. "*All of that is present and we can name it; its proof is that we*

cannot put into question its being as absolute subjectivity." (VP 94n1/72n*t*) That for which we lack names in the Living Present, Derrida explains, is simply its 'absolute properties,' in other words its relative objective determinations in opposition to the absoluteness of its subjectivity. The flux of the Living Present for Husserl, I showed, lacks all temporal objectivity. But, as Derrida shows, this means that even the self-presence of absolute subjectivity is supplementarily constituted by its unnameable object: its absolute properties. Against this constituting subjectivity, whether transcendental or absolute, the relations to time and the other reveal subjectivity as always already constituted: the concept of constitution itself demanding deconstruction, he adds. When Derrida speaks of 'radicalizing' Husserl's determination of the unnamability of the Living Present, it is because to think the Living Present on the basis of différance means to erase its determination as absolute subjectivity.[123]

> This pure difference, which constitutes the self-presence of the living present, reintroduces into it originarily all the impurity we had believed we were able to exclude from it. The living present arises on the basis of its non-self-identity, and on the basis of the retentional trace. It is always already a trace. The trace is not an attribute about which we could say that the self of the living present 'is originarily' the trace. It is necessary to think originary-being from the trace and not the trace from originary being. (VP 95/73)

As every impurity one believed one could exclude, reduce and bracket from the interiority of the Living Present comes to constitute it originarily – that is to say every transcendence, exteriority, every alterity, the world, materiality, etc. – "The trace is the intimacy of the living present to its outside, the openness to exteriority in general, to the non-proper, etc., *the temporalization of sense is from the very beginning 'spacing.'* (VP 96/73) The exteriority of space, Derrida writes, is 'in' time; temporalization is precisely this opening to its outside, indeed to the world. Time can therefore never be the pure interiority and self-presence of an absolute subjectivity because "the 'world' is originarily implied by the movement of transcendence." (VP 96/74)

Despite these analyses, however, one should be cautious to not privilege the ultratranscendental concept of time in relation to the other exteriorities it makes possible, since these in turn also function as its own condition of possibility. The opening of the present to its outside is inseparable from intersubjectivity.[124] Even Husserl himself admits a relation of analogy between the relation to the alter ego and that to future of past moments in the Living Present.[125] As both temporal delay or deferral and spatial alterity and difference, différance, Derrida writes, is "temporalization and spacing, the becoming-time of space and the becoming

space of time." (MP 8/8) The living now of the Living Present must pass through both the mediations of temporal re-tention (temporalization) and spatial, intersubjective analogical re-presentation (alterity) to constitute itself, and this relation between time and the other, Derrida writes, is nothing less than the history of life. Without wanting to reduce the 'abyss' that can separate these two, Derrida argues that the trace, as the common root of their relationships, "is nothing other than the history of 'life' and of life's becoming-conscious." (VP 75/58) The trace is indeed, I said above, the very condition of the relationality between any living beings, whether human, animal, fungal, vegetal, bacterial, viral, even problematizing the distinction between the living and the non-living. And it is also at the heart of the ethics of an ecological relationality of compassion for the mortal finitude of other living beings. As Derrida writes in *Of Grammatology*, "the relation with the other and the relation with death are one and the same opening."[126] (DG 265/187)

Despite the four transcendences from the Living Present being, in a sense, the same, the relation to death must claim a certain originarity, if not a privilege at least in my discussions of survivance and life death. In *Voice and Phenomenon*, Derrida suggests that every exit from the life of a self-present presence into the world, space and nature would bear the structure of a process of and relation to death.[127] In *Of Grammatology*, the objective and spatial exteriority that appears as most familiar to us could never appear "without différance as temporalization, without the nonpresence of the other inscribed within the sense of the present, without the relationship with death as the concrete structure of the living present."[128] (DG 103/71) At the heart of the most familiar, of the *oikos*, the trace is "the opening of the first exteriority in general, the enigmatic relationship of the living to its other and of an inside to an outside: spacing." (DG 103/70) This book concludes in showing a mortal doubling, representation and repetition to originarily constitute and supplement the Living Present, which allows me to further deepen my discussion of the pre-subjective transcendental field and its potential for thinking ecological relationality.[129] In *Voice and Phenomenon,* Derrida recalls that the Living Present, as the universal form of all lived experience and all life, is always and irreducibly *mine*.[130] Even in the annihilation of the world in the *Epokhè*, and in the event of my absolute empirical disappearance, the Living Present as the universal form of transcendental life would be unaffected. For Derrida, however, this logic dissimulates a relation to my death and my disappearance in general as the condition of transcendental life. The possibility of my death and absolute disappearance would

not come to modify a preexisting subject. Rather, "the appearing of the *I* to itself in the *I am* is therefore originarily the relation to its own possible disappearance. *I am* means therefore originarily *I am mortal*. *I am immortal* is an impossible proposition."[131] (VP 60-1/46)

This relation to death, I'll show, is itself the condition of what I'm calling the arche-writing of ecological relationality; the pre-subjective and pre-egological transcendental field as an "originary exteriority." (DG 443/315) While the self-presence of the living voice is classically seen as contaminated by the exteriority of writing, the relation to writing, and indeed to its death, is its very condition of possibility.[132] Beyond any classical opposition of inside and outside, writing in general or arche-writing entails that "the division between exterior and interior passes through the interior of the interior or the exterior of the exterior, to the point where the immanence of language is essentially exposed to the intervention of forces that are apparently alien to its system." (DG 63/43) This writing

> is the becoming-absent and the becoming-unconscious of the subject... This becoming – or this drift/derivation – does not befall the subject that would choose it or passively let itself be drawn along with it. As the subject's relationship with its own death, this becoming is the constitution of subjectivity. On all levels of life's organization, that is to say, of the *economy of death*." (DG 100/69*t*)

And here we have, I believe, the clearest conjunction of the pre-subjective transcendental field and a relational ecology of life death, where the spacing of arche-writing marks what Derrida calls a 'dead time' within the Living Present.[133] The transcendences complicating the restricted ecology of the Living Present are indeed its inscription in arche-writing, its opening to temporalization, intersubjectivity and language itself.[134] This language and writing, however, must be understood as radically anterior to the opposition between the human and its other. Derrida even speaks of arche-writing as nature de-naturing itself; "nature is affected – from the outside – by an upheaval that modifies it in its inside, denatures it and obligates it to be diverted from itself. Nature denaturing itself, diverting itself *from itself*, naturally welcoming its outside into its inside." (DG 61/41*t*)

Throughout *Of Grammatology*, an ecological determination of arche-writing lets itself be confirmed, as I showed in chapter 1 in a discussion of the *pro-gramme*.[135] To think the trace as the retention of difference as such, another Living Present within my own, requires

> a synthesis within which the wholly other is announced as such – without any simplicity, identity, resemblance or continuity – within what it is not. *Is announced as such:* there we

> have all of *history*, from what metaphysics has determined as the 'non-living,' up to 'consciousness,' passing through all levels of animal organization. (DG 69/47*t*)

Derrida would return to these questions decades later in *For What Tomorrow*, where he recalls that the concept of the trace in *Of Grammatology* "had to be extended to the entire field of the living, or rather to the life/death relation," he adds that "'concepts of writing, trace, grammè or grapheme' exceeded the opposition human/nonhuman," and that these extensions would also hold for différance. (DQ 106-7/63) "Indissociable from this concept of the gramme or the trace, and however 'unthinkable' it may seem, différance extends to 'life:death' in general and brings the economic and the aneconomic into an alliance beyond the limits of the human." (DQ 107n1/210n2) And it is again a question of how différance and the trace will articulate the economic and the aneconomic that is so important general ecology, "the relation of the living to its other and of an inside to an outside," where *tout autre est tout autre*, "articulating the living upon the nonliving in general." (DG 103/70, 95/65) Différance is there "as soon as there is a living trace, a relation of life/death or presence/absence... as soon as there is something living [*du vivant*]." (DQ 43/21) Originarily complicating the Living Present, Derrida indeed speaks of an "originary violence of writing." (DG 55/37) To think arche-writing as the condition of ecological relationality connects directly to the difficult ethics I broached in "Violence and Metaphysics." As he writes, "there is no ethics without the presence *of the other* but also, and consequently, without absence, dissimulation, detour, différance, writing. The arche-writing is the origin of morality as of immorality. The nonethical opening of ethics. A violent opening." (DG 202/139-40) But, as I showed, the irreducibility of the imprint also structures the living as a radical passivity, not only as the relation to an immemorial past but as a hetero-affection at the heart of auto-affection; the universal structure of experience for all living things.[136] Only a being capable of auto-affection "may let itself be affected by the other in general." (DG 236/165) The possibility of letting oneself be affected by alterity in general is, for Derrida, "another name for 'life' – is a general structure articulated by the history of life."[137] (DG 236/165) Against the purity of an auto-affection admitting no exteriority, in what Derrida calls 'auto-hetero-affection,' just as with ex-appropriation, "the exteriority of space is irreducible... welcomes the other within the slim difference that separates acting and suffering [*pâtir*]. And the outside, the exposed surface of the body, signifies and marks forever the division that shapes auto-affection."[138] (DG 235/165) The interruption of organic auto-affection must itself be thought as death, the

inorganic, the techno-machinic. This radical passivity originarily inscribes all the transcendences of temporalization, materiality, alterity and death at the heart of the Living Present, of the self-present, self-identical subject and thus refigures the ground of transcendental lived experience [*le vécu*] as the arche-writing of ecological relationality, of *le vivant*. But despite these difficult analyses, I have still yet to broach the ethical implications and potentials of this, and I use the word under erasure here, *ontology* of radical passivity. A detailed analysis of this must wait for my following chapter on Heidegger, but I can conclude with a few points on this articulation of the ontological and the ethical, the material and the ideal, and a thought of a historiality which would disclose the ethical-ontological fallacy of the naturalistic fallacy.

§2.3.2: General Ecology: The Parliament of the Sur-viving Present

It might seem as though I have neglected the transcendences of the material world, of materiality itself and of empirical reality in these analyses. To treat these questions in the early Derrida through the concept of history might seem perplexing if one did not recall that, along with the question of the possibility of scientific knowledge, history constitutes one of his earliest interests in phenomenology. Much will be at stake in this thought of a history beyond the opposition between the so-called 'natural' and 'human' sciences. What fascinates Derrida about Husserl with respect to the transmission of ideal objects is that while these have their roots in empirical facticity (the *Introduction* shows how language and writing play an essential role in ideality), this empiricity can become immediately bracketed in the phenomenological reduction and the investigation of the transcendental conditions of scientific knowledge. As the universal *form* of transcendental experience, the Living Present goes hand in hand with the founding opposition of metaphysics for Derrida, that of form and matter, and along with it the hierarchical dualisms between culture and nature, the intelligible and the sensible, the human and its others, all of which would have collaborated in the exclusion of arche-writing in a "naturalist, objectivist, and derivative determination of the difference between outside and inside."[139] (DG 105/71) All these oppositions, it seems, serve to reinforce a logic of identity, keeping the outside out and the proper uncontaminated. What one could call Derrida's logic of supplementary transcendence, however, would thoroughly complicate this distinction between inside and outside in inscribing the beyond within the Living Present.[140] Furthermore, I have shown that phenomenology constitutes for Derrida a philosophy of life not only because death can be bracketed as a mere

external and empirical accident befalling life, but because even after the reduction of empirical life one is still left with transcendental life and consciousness, even after the annihilation of the world in the *Epokhè*. Derrida, however, will always insist on an essential contamination between the transcendental and the empirical, but a contamination that, one must recall, is wholly other than their reciprocal immanence. Far from a simple mnemonic technique supervening upon ideality, writing is instead revealed as ideality's originary transcendental condition of possibility. Far from a simple external accident befalling life, death is revealed as the original condition of its sur-vival. The ultratranscendental concept of life put forth by Derrida insists precisely on this contamination, articulating the transcendental and the empirical and its other transcendences across the 'nothing' separating them, this nothing which (is) différance, as the supplementary difference of a death which is itself nothing and impossible to die, and inscribes its impersonal materiality at the heart of the form of the Living Present.[141]

And this is why, for Derrida, even the most radical phenomenological reduction, the total annihilation of the world in the *Epokhè*, cannot sustain itself without the inassimilable alterity of the material world. The pure form of the Living Present is originarily contaminated by this material remainder, one could call it the restances, the *res(is)tances* of the arche-materiality of time, alterity and death. Even after the annihilation of the world, there remains an inappropriable and constitutive alterity at the heart of transcendental subjectivity. And there lies, in a sense, the beginning of the ethics of Celan's poem Derrida cites above; "*die Welt ist fort, ich muss dich tragen*," where the 'tragen,' the carrying, demands, in the absence of the world, "*to carry oneself or bear oneself* toward [se porter *vers*] the infinite inappropriability of the other, toward the encounter with its absolute transcendence in the very heart of me, that is to say, in me outside me." (SQ 161) As mentioned in the conclusion to §2.1, this carrying cannot be accomplished in the dialectic of the Living Present, but wholly otherwise, must let the time of the other come.[142] The possibility of justice relies precisely on this disjunction and non-contemporaneity of the Living Present: its being 'out of joint' installs the relation to the other.[143] *The world is gone* indeed, but justice also cannot maintain itself without this carrying, "without the promise of a now in common, without the pledge, the vow of synchrony, the desired sharing of a living present." (P2 135/131) Perhaps everything I am trying to say here involves the passivity of this letting, irreducible to the opposition of passivity and activity, a *letting beings be* before and beyond their determination as human, animal, fungal, vegetal and so on. But this in no way takes

away from the stricture of the '*ich muss*'; I must, one must, *il faut*. The 'il faut' in Derrida adheres precisely to the complication of the *fait* and *droit*, *de facto* and *de jure*, empirical facticity and transcendental possibility, and functions both as an originary violence and an ethical transcendence, the necessity and impossibility of an ethics of ecological relationality. In this ethics, I must carry the other across the abyss of a world gone away, I must as the very empirical condition of my being-present, and I must also in an ethical sense, I must carry the other across and in its infinite transcendence despite and perhaps precisely because of and through this impossibility. I must not pre-determine the absolute and infinitely transcendent alterity that constitutes my originary ecological relationality, but I must, and have always already begun to. It is perhaps in a certain vigilance towards this originary violence that a post-deconstructive account of ecological subjectivity, if one even needs to keep the word, can let itself be sought.[144]

In a sense, the complications posed to the Husserlian Living Present by Derrida can be read as the reinscription of what calls itself the human subject within an-other thought of history, its *pre-history* before and beyond Husserl's crisis, which is really a crisis of European humanity, a thought of history that would mark the infinite telos of the Living Present with a radical finitude.[145] However, the crisis of the European sciences for Husserl is not an accident befalling historical teleology. The possibility of the impossibility of a full and immediate intuition, of the fulfillment of the phenomenological principle of principles in the Living Present "is not simply negative; the trap becomes a chance." (NII 402n24) As he shows in *Of Grammatology*, the possibility of crisis is connected to the possibility of truth, its inscription in writing, indeed within the arche-writing of ecological relationality I am discussing here. As an Idea in the Kantian sense, the self-presence of consciousness functions as an ideal and infinitely anticipated universality and unity of a world in the face of its factical finitude. This thought of ideality implies that the Living Present itself is, in fact, and in reality, infinitely deferred.[146] What this means, he explains, is that the infinite teleology of transcendental life and history is originarily inscribed with death and the real, the material and the empirical. Différance, he adds, "becomes the finitude of life as the essential relation to itself and to its death. *Infinite différance is finite*. One can no longer think it within the opposition of finitude or infinity, absence and presence, negation and affirmation." (VP 114/97*t*) Derrida even refers to this in *Rogues* as transcendental phenomenological *auto-immunity* in the Living Present.[147] In this finite/infinite différance of the Living Present, "the difference between principle and fact, ideality and reality" erases itself,

"their possibility is their impossibility." (VP 113/87) An ecological democracy-to-come, the Parliament of the Living as David Wood has called it, can precisely never be a utopian future democracy, a regulating Idea, since its inaccessibility "would still retain the temporal form of a *future present*, of a future modality of the *living present*." (SM 110/81) This teleological structure would moreover annul and neutralize the unknowability and incalculability of the transcendence of the alterity of the other in my ecological relationality. How far must this democracy-to-come extend, Derrida asks?

> Must we extend it to the whole world of singularities, to the whole world of humans assumed to be like me, my compeers [*mes semblables*] – or else, even further, to all nonhuman living beings, or again, even beyond that, to all the nonliving, to their memory, spectral or otherwise, to their to-come or to their indifference with regard to what we think we can identify, in an always precipitous, dogmatic, and obscure way, as the life or the living present of living [*la vivance*] in general... to the dead, to animals, to trees and rocks? (V 81-2/53-4)

As Derrida writes, the absolute teleological horizon of the unity of the world "leaves no place for the alterity or the radical foreignness of this other, the absolute arrivant... no place for any 'other world.'" (FP 25*t*) The unity of the world, however, is also the very condition of hospitality, of a sharing of the earth.[148] As I will continue to develop the general ecology of this *oikos*, "the at home in general that welcomes the absolute *arrivant*," one must keep in mind that, as I noted in my discussion of Levinas, the arrivant must exceed every horizon of anticipation. (A 68/34) Or rather, as Derrida puts it, this horizon, "even before letting *itself* be traversed, is traversed, passively, by some wholly other. Here is what would require (without requiring anything) the surprise of the arrivant, that is to say the wholly other that irrupts in a space I call mine or I attempt to appropriate for myself." (FP 26*t*) To think the *oikos* of this at-home is to think what I in chapter 1 followed Derrida in calling the unity without unity, totality or homogeneity of the world, the earth or the world of life death. One can only think this ecology in the ruin of intentionality, in "the annulment of experience itself: the encounter affected, at the heart of a non-intentional passivity, by the arrivant, the wholly other that comes upon us." (FP 30*t*) Beyond any horizon of anticipation, one must think ecology as "relation to the future, the other, the event – and death," open to an alterity of "what one so easily calls an animal or a god. Good or evil, life or death." (FP 26-7*t*) It is through Heidegger, however, that Derrida will sharpen the strictures of life-death and survivance in the thought of ecological relationality I am attempting to develop. The relation between *de facto* and *de jure*, and ontology and ethics, will find itself

thoroughly complicated, if not altogether jettisoned. While for Heidegger as well, the thought of transcendental historicity is one reserved to the human Dasein, *as are indeed all of the transcendences from which we have been unable to indemnify the Living Present* (an authentic relation to time, access to the alterity of the other, to death, to the world *as such*, and indeed the very concept of transcendence will require an important reinterrogation through Heidegger), not to mention to language and to an access to the very question of Being, anterior to the opposition of affirmation and negation and the metaphysics of Presence, Heidegger's thought opens for Derrida a deeper understanding of the radical passivity and unpower shared by all living beings, and a complication of the *letting* I find so essential to ecological ethics. This letting, I'll show, is an opening to an affirmation, to a yes in the form of a promise which would at once confirm the philosophical invulnerability of transcendental life, historiality and the Living Present of human subjectivity while exposing it originarily to its own impossibility, its ecological *pre-history* and pre-subjectivity and an an-other thought of ethics for sharing the earth and the world of life-death more justly with its other living beings.

It is this resistance that interests me. It is this excess that at once, since forever, has made events, ruptures, effects of difference possible everywhere, and not only in what we call the history of humanity: I would even say everywhere that there is life and animality.

Jacques Derrida: "L'esprit de l'argent," 207.

Three: Resistance and Ex-appropriation: Letting Life Live-On

While in the previous chapter, I had attempted to show how the transcendences of organic life in and as temporalization, alterity, materiality and death necessitated a radical rethinking of ecological relationality, my intent was not to generalize these structures across 'the living in general,' but rather to think the 'general' itself as the multiplication, pluralization and articulation of limits, each time infinitely abyssal and yet infinitely demanding, as I read Celan's line '*die Welt ist fort ich muss dich tragen*.' It is through Heidegger's rethinking of transcendence itself, "of Being as a non-generic generality, as transcending *generality*," that I will sharpen this originarily differential and interruptive relationality at the heart of ecology along with its implications for environmental philosophy, biopolitics, science and translation. (HQ 31/7) However, Heidegger's overreliance on the concepts of the authentic [*Eigentlich*] the proper [*Eigen*] to man, the propriative event [*Ereignis*], gathering [*Versammlung*], of justice as jointure [*Fug*] and so on will in the end restrict the latter's thought to the circulation of what I'm calling restricted ecology. These structures will come to designate Heidegger's interpretation of *Walten*, his translation of the Greek word for what we call 'nature,' *phusis*: "Being, *phusis*, is, as sway [*als Walten*], originary gatheredness [*Gesammeltheit*]: *logos*. Being is fittingness [*Fug*] that enjoins: *dike*."[1] (GA *40* 123/171) We've already encountered Heidegger many times in chapter 1; I showed Derrida suggest that Freud's death drive bears an important similarity to Husserl's Living Present and Heidegger's auto-affective temporalization. I'd also mentioned that auto-affective temporalization, for Derrida, was irreducible to what he called the finite promise of the earth. In chapter 2 I showed that like Husserl, Heidegger's concept of world restricts its access 'as such' to the human, the two understanding 'world' in terms of unity, coherence and belonging. Back in chapter 1, I'd also begun examining Derrida's logic of the remainder, the resistance of a *restance* that would be irreducible to dialectical, transcendental or ontological questioning.[2] I'd then suggested that this resistance necessitated a thought of materiality as the absolute Outside, akin to what I'd discussed in Husserl's concept of the *urhylè* as the *ichfremde kern*, irreducible to the opposition of form and matter. If restricted ecology concerns itself with

the proper, the familial, the calculable and the *oikos*, general ecology binds its logic to something that resists this propriation, that ex-propriates it and interrupts its economy without return. *Ex-appropriation* is another name for this stricture that concerns itself with both dialectical, transcendental and ontological propriation in their economies and ecologies and the irreducible alterity resisting this circulation.[3] To think the materiality of this res(is)tance anterior to the opposition of form and matter is another way to bring into conversation Derrida's critique of form in 'Form and Fashion,' where Heidegger is also targeted.[4] This will have important implications for the discussions of biopolitics in chapters 4 and 5: while Foucault understands sovereign power as the capacity to make die and let live, and biopower as the power to make live and let die, I'm trying to think a concept of resistance anterior to the opposition of power and resistance, and a *letting life live-on* anterior to the opposition of making and letting live and die, one that I think would strangely be beyond differentials of violence, force, power and even *Walten* itself (but in a sense of 'beyond' remaining to be determined).[5] As I will show in chapter 6, these questions will be of the utmost importance not only to contemporary science and technology studies but also to issues of translation and ecolinguistics. To posit nature in the sense of classical physics as infinitely calculable and determinable non-relational objects, I'll show, shares an almost total conceptual overlap with what Heidegger calls the breaking-apart of language into "word-Things which are present-at-hand." (GA *2* 161/204) When grammar seizes control of language,

> language surrenders itself to our mere willing and trafficking as an instrument of domination over beings. Beings themselves appear as actualities in the interaction of cause and effect. We encounter beings as actualities in a calculative businesslike way, but also scientifically and by way of philosophy, with explanations and proofs. (GA *9* 318/243)

Perhaps, however, Heidegger's later concept of the *Zusage*, an affirmation anterior to language and the question – within which, for Derrida, "one must seek a new (post-deconstructive) determination of the responsibility of the subject" – can place us another step along the path to thinking the posthuman promise of the earth. (PDS 268)

I begin, in §3.1.1, by exploring the ontological and ethical complications Heidegger poses to Scheler's notion of organic resistance via the transcendence of Dasein. This transcendence, I show, not only originarily situates Dasein in a world and with others, but also discloses, in Dasein's powerlessness, its capacity to let beings be outside of their calculability and use-value.

In §3.1.2, I turn to an examination of how Heidegger links the determination of *phusis* as *idea* at the end of Greek philosophy with this calculative comportment towards beings and the objectification of nature, and tie this in to the critique of form I've taken up in chapters 1 and 2 to suggest the necessity of thinking a material resistance beyond the classical oppositions of form and matter, making and letting. I then in §3.1.3 turn to Heidegger's concepts of auto-affective temporalization and being-towards-death, and show how these, in the powerlessness and passivity of resistance with which they constitute Dasein, expose it to an alterity which it can never master but can only let be. This resistance, I argue, is indeed a dead, inorganic materiality that originarily constitutes every living being and expropriates these structures from the proper of the human. I turn to Derrida's reading of Heidegger in §3.2, and in §3.2.1 explore the *destruktion* Derrida sees the former undertake of the Husserlian Living Present with respect to its idealism, subjectivism, humanism and complicity with technological calculability, marking these all with the transcendence of Dasein. In §3.2.2, I show how Derrida defends ontological transcendence as the sole possibility of Levinasian ethical transcendence. But, as in his reading of Husserl, a certain change of emphasis occurs here: if "Violence and Metaphysics" is Derrida's necessary binding of Levinasian transcendence to a restricted ecology, all his later readings of Heidegger will seek this ex-propriation, impossibility, otherwise than Being and aneconomy within the latter's discourse. §3.2.3 thus develops these logics of ex-appropriation with respect to Heidegger's notions of *Ent-eignis*, *Ent-fernung* and their relevance for Derrida's concepts of the gift, the promise and justice. If both Heideggerian and Levinasian transcendence solely concern the proper of the human, however, this relation requires another articulation for what I'm trying to do with general ecology. §3.2.4 recalls several well-known examples of Derrida's engagement of the animal question with respect to Heidegger, where the animal is denied access not only to time, death, the other and the world 'as such,' but also the transcendence that would allow it to let beings be.[6] In §3.2.5, however, I conclude by suggesting that Heidegger's concepts of the *Zusage*, *Gelassenheit* and *Verlässlichkeit* allow precisely for rethinking this transcendence in the promise of the earth and the general ecological ethics and ontology of letting life live-on.

§3.1: Heidegger and Res(is)tance

§3.1.1: Dasein's Resistance and Transcendence: World, Others and Things.

Many environmental philosophers have argued that the move beyond the calculative, indeed economic frameworks of moral extensionism must rest on a certain articulation of ethics and ontology.[7] How this articulation gives itself to be thought – whether as the mutual immanence of the ethical and the ontological or along what I'm proposing with the stricture of general ecology – being one of the key stakes of my study. The question is also one of asking whether the concept of 'value,' even in its refiguration as the 'intrinsic' ethical value of non-human organisms, abiotic environments, nature and the earth, understood as and through their ontological properties (relationality, drive for survival, *conatus essendi,* symbiosis) is sufficient to think what I'm attempting with general ecology. Or, is the concept of value itself too closely tied up with economic circulation and a thought of ecology as a merely cyclical and reappropriative flow of life and death? In my first chapter, I showed Derrida suggest that any ecological living-together ought not regulate itself on either organic symbiosis or on any juridico-political contract but rather give itself to be thought as an interruptive excess – the very condition of justice being the anachrony with itself of the Living Present – an excess which must be thought (although it is almost unthinkable, impossible) beyond all economic calculation and reappropriation, as well as beyond the oppositions of *physis/nomos*, *physis/thesis* and all other oppositions of 'nature' to its others.[8]

In his "Letter on Humanism," Heidegger responds to a letter from Jean Beaufret in which the latter writes "what I have been trying to do for a long time now is to determine precisely the relation of ontology to a possible ethics." (GA *9* 353/268) Of course, Heidegger notes, a concern for the ethical is of the utmost importance, especially in an age in which the human orders all its plans and activities according to technology.[9] As he shows, however, early Greek thought did not separate itself into the disciplines of logic, physics and ethics, but did think a concept of *phusis*. *Phusis*, he writes, "says what emerges from itself (for example, the emergence, the blossoming of a rose), the unfolding that opens itself up, the coming-into-appearance in such unfolding, and holding itself and persisting in appearance – in short, the emerging-abiding sway [*Walten*]." (GA *40* 11/15) All physicalist and naturalist determinations of 'nature' would be derivative from this concept of *phusis.* The Greeks, he adds, also thought an *ethos*, an abode or dwelling place, which persists in our word 'ethics.' *Ethos* is also a thinking of the *oikos* in economy and ecology.[10]

As is well known, Heidegger's entire philosophical project revolves around thinking the meaning and truth of Being. If ethics bears some relation to *ethos*, he argues, then the original ethics would be that which thinks the abode of man as the truth of Being. While this thinking would seem to correspond more closely to ontology than to ethics in its concern for existence and Being, Heidegger would increasingly distance himself from the term 'ontology' so prevalent in *Being and Time*.[11] By 1935, Heidegger will write that Being is *phusis*.[12] As he explains in the "Letter," to think the truth of Being is in fact impossible for ontology, which cannot really think the wholly other dimension of language that is the poetic Saying [*sage*], the language that is the house of Being. In the end, both ethics and ontology are incapable of thinking the human's essential dwelling in the truth of Being.

These questions of ethics and ontology are also at the heart of thinking life death on earth with its others in Derrida's work, who writes that

> relations between humans and animals [and, we add here, any other living being, fungal, vegetal, bacterial, viral] *must* change. They *must*, both in the sense of an 'ontological' necessity and of an 'ethical' duty. I place these words in quotation marks because this change will have to affect the very sense and value of these concepts (the ontological and the ethical). (DQ 108/64)

But what sort of obligation might such a change the sense and value of these terms imply? As concerns how the thinking of Being might be applied to our active lives, Heidegger claims that it is beyond the opposition of theory and practice, having no result or effect.[13] Before any naïve or volitional theory of action, the thought of Being *lets beings be*: it lets beings be what they are and understands beings *as such*.[14] Ethics and ontology then are derivative with respect to thinking the meaning of dwelling in the house of Being, in its *oikos*, the originary structure of being-in-the-world, Being in relation to *phusis*, to beings-as-a-whole and letting them be. This question of letting, broached in my discussions of passivity in chapters 1 and 2, has important environmental and ethical implications for Heidegger, who writes in "Building, Dwelling, Thinking" that

> mortals dwell in that they save the earth... Saving does not only snatch something from a danger. To save properly means to set something free into its own essence. To save the earth is more than to exploit it or even wear it out. Saving the earth does not master the earth and does not subjugate it, which is merely one step from boundless spoliation.[15] (GA *7* 152/BW 352)

What I'll call letting life live-on cannot go without a thought of death, a death I'll reveal as the originary ex-propriation of the proper to the human. Beyond an ethics of calculation which would

delimit the scope of moral considerability according to what a living organism *can do* – and I recall that Derrida draws from Bentham the injunction to think a radical passivity in suffering and in death, a passion or a non-power as the source of compassion – Heidegger places us on an important path towards thinking the passivity of letting, the finitude of life, and of death as the possibility of an impossibility.[16] The thinking of Being must necessarily take its distance from a positing of value, indeed – and I'll examine this in much more detail in his critique of Nietzsche in chapter 4 – both the positing of values and their critical disestablishment and revaluation equally rely on a wilful and self-congratulatory subjectivism.

> Precisely through the characterization of something as 'a value' what is so valued is robbed of its worth. That is to say, by the assessment of something as a value what is valued is admitted only as an object for human estimation. But what a thing is in its being is not exhausted by its being an object, particularly when objectivity takes the form of value. Every valuing, even where it values positively, is a subjectivizing. It does not let beings: be. Rather, valuing lets being: be valid – solely as the objects of its doing. (GA *9* 349/265)

Heidegger's thinking of Being thus seems to not only break with the economic calculation of subjectivist moral extensionism, but also seems to caution against a certain equally economic rehabilitation of the concept of value, inviting us to think the 'worth' of life death on earth otherwise. On Derrida's reading of Heidegger however, the latter's own restriction of his analyses of transcendence, being-in-the-world, being-towards-death and being-with others to the proper of the human constitutes not only the Achilles' heel of the entire project of fundamental ontology for the former, but also of everything following his much discussed *Kehre* or turning, which, for David Farrell Krell, indeed constitutes an intensification of this anthropocentrism, if this turning can be said to exist at all.[17] In what follows, and building on the insights of my previous chapter (namely, Derrida's claim that phenomenology is a philosophy of life), I'll show that thinking together life and intentionality in their resistance in the Heideggerean sense lends a new rhythm to the questions of life and death, self and other/world, idealism and materialism/realism, form and matter, immanence and transcendence, 'nature' and all its others worthwhile for the development of general ecology.

Heidegger's early confrontations with life-philosophy [*Lebensphilosophie*] in Dilthey and Scheler are well documented, as are his engagements with and critiques of Husserlian phenomenology, and, I'll show in chapter 4, his critique of biologism.[18] In an early 1925 lecture, *The History of the Concept of Time*, Heidegger argues against Scheler that we cannot entirely

understand reality as that which resists against drive and effort, although noting himself that this comes closest to his own interpretation of reality. For Scheler, the resistance of the world is understood as the correlate to a subjective will, impulse and striving, which grounds not only his interpretation of biological facts but also his epistemology, which is itself rooted in the question of how a world is given to primitive life forms.[19] For Heidegger, however,

> this method of clarifying by analogy from primitive life forms down to single-celled animals is wrong in principle. It is only when we have apprehended the objectivity of the world which is available to us [to humans, presumably], that is to say, our relationship of being toward the world, that we can perhaps also determine the worldhood of the animal by certain modified ways of considering it. (GA *20* 305/222)

The authentic correlation of world and the human Dasein for Heidegger is not one between impulse and resistance, but one of care, meaningfulness and concern. In fact, these relations constitute the possibility of resistance in the first place: "resistance is a phenomenological character *which already presupposes a world*." (GA *20* 304/222) Drive and will are both modifications of care, and

> [o]nly entities with this kind of Being [care] can come up against something resistant as something in the world…resistance characterizes the 'external world' in the sense of entities within-the-world, but never in the sense of the world itself. *Consciousness of Reality is itself a way of Being-in-the-world*. Every 'problematic of the external world' comes back necessarily to this basic existential phenomenon. (GA *2* 211/254)

Heidegger thus inverts the Cartesian *cogito*: rather than 'I think therefore I am,' 'I am' as 'I am in a world' becomes the primary assertion, and grounds the possibility of *cogitationes*, comporting oneself alongside other beings in the world.[20] Only the kinds of Being who have care as their basic existential structure, the human Dasein, can have an authentic relation to the world as such. The phenomenon of material resistance as experienced by non-human life does not disclose a world for these organisms, and if present at all in the human Dasein's experience is secondary to Dasein's authentic and originary Being-in-the-world. If one could think, then, a certain arche-material res(is)tance at the heart of the human Dasein's transcendence, this would perhaps be sufficient to ex-appropriate any axiomatic or economy regulated upon its self-assured propriety, but I am still a ways off from this analysis.

As I will show, this question of Being-in proposes a radical rethinking of the questions of self and world, transcendence and immanence. What is meant by the transcendence of Dasein is

difficult in Heidegger, and differs importantly from that which I examined in Husserl and Levinas. As Heidegger puts it, the meaningfulness of the world for Dasein is

> not a network of forms which a worldless subject has laid over some kind of material… the 'problem of transcendence' cannot be brought round to the question of how a subject comes out to an Object, when the aggregate of objects is identified with the idea of the world. Rather, we must ask; what makes it ontologically possible for entities to be encountered within-the-world and Objectified as so encountered? (GA *2* 366/417-8)

In other words, what does it mean, ontologically, to encounter entities as such, in the Being of their being? For Heidegger, this requires thinking what he calls the 'ecstatico-horizonal' foundation of the transcendence of the world.[21] While I must delay the considerations of temporalization as this ecstatico-horizonal, indeed auto-affective foundation, allow me to further inquire into this question of transcendence. As Heidegger explains, the temporality of the understanding of Being – the understanding of its meaning as such, as a question, in its difference from beings – can only be grasped on the basis of its connection with the transcendence of Dasein. Transcending Dasein understands beings in their Being because Dasein is already in a world, and the transcendence of the world is its own. The transcendence of the world and that of Dasein are the same thing: Dasein's transcendence is Being-in-the-world. Heidegger thus proposes a relational structure of transcendence anterior to any derived opposition between materialism/idealism, realism/idealism, outside/inside, object/subject.[22] As the co-belonging of self and world, Dasein is "the *transcendent.*"[23] Beings are always encountered within a world and thus presuppose a certain understanding of world, whose transcendence is beyond that of objects and *is* the transcendence of Dasein. As he elaborates in "On the Essence of Ground," the world is that towards which Dasein transcends, and this world is beings-as-a-whole, what I earlier called *phusis*. "'Dasein transcends' means: in the essence of its being it is *world-forming*, 'forming' [*bildend*] in the multiple sense that it *lets* world occur."[24] (GA *9* 158/123*e*) Dasein, in other words, lets *phusis*, as the totality of beings, occur.

The slogan of phenomenology, 'to the things themselves!,' or 'to the subject matters themselves!' means precisely to encounter things as they are encountered, to perceive things as they are perceived. *Apophainesthai ta phainomena* means "*to let that which shows itself be seen from itself in the way in which it shows itself from itself*." (GA *2* 34/58*e*) To the difference of the Husserl of *Ideas I*, however, this letting something show itself is only possible on the basis of Dasein's transcendence as Being-in-the-world. One will recall that in the Husserlian *Epokhe*, the

analysis of the pure life of consciousness and of transcendental lived experience entails the annihilation of the entire world, what Heidegger calls a 'not-going-along-with' the material and transcendent world, a thought of the world as alien, other, separated from the pure, ideal and absolute being of consciousness by a gulf.[25] Pure consciousness, in its absolute immanence, must be understood as absolute and pure Being, having no need for real, transcendent beings or things.[26] For Heidegger, however, the transcendence of Dasein is nothing other than Being-in-the-world. As such, the absolute idealism of Husserl's *Ideas I* neglects the question of Being.

As Heidegger explains, transcendence in the philosophical sense is usually used to designate a being beyond worldly being. In a theological sense, it can refer to God, while in an epistemological sense, in what he calls the theory of knowledge and as he attributes it to Husserlian phenomenology, the transcendent refers to what lies beyond the subject's sphere of immanence, where the subject is like a box that must be stepped out of to attain the transcendent thing. Resisting both interpretations, transcendence for Heidegger is

> not a relationship between interior and exterior realms such that a barrier belonging to the subject would be crossed over, a barrier that would separate the subject from the outer realm. But neither is transcendence primarily the cognitive relationship a subject has to an object, one belonging to the subject in addition to its subjectivity. Nor is transcendence simply the term for what exceeds and is inaccessible to finite knowledge. (GA *26* 210-1/165)

Rather, what Heidegger calls 'the transcendent' appears to cohere more with the relation of overstepping, the '*pas au-delà*' itself, than it does that which is stepped towards: 'the transcendent' is the relation of transcendence and not the transcendent object.[27] As such, the relations between transcendence and immanence as I have shown them used in Husserlian phenomenology undergo a complete inversion; the sphere of the subject is no longer the immanent but the transcendent, one within which Dasein is always already outside with other beings and the world. Transcendence is thus presupposed by whatever one may call the ego, individual, self or subject.[28] If one is to choose the term 'subject' at all, then "to *be* a subject means to be a being in and as transcendence." (GA *9* 137/108)

While transcendence constitutes the selfhood of the Dasein, this does not entail that the world is related to Dasein egoistically. To say so, whether at the level of other Daseins or of natural things, would be to confuse an ontic or existentiell relation (concerned with beings) for an ontological one (concerned with Being). To say that Dasein understands beings as for-the-sake-

of-itself simply means for Heidegger that Dasein is concerned with its own being and projects.[29] All 'ethical' determinations of an egotistical or altruistic relationship to beings are derivative determinations of Dasein's metaphysical isolation, since its transcendence as being-in-the-world is itself being-with-others. "It becomes clear that the problem of *empathy* is just as absurd as the question of the reality of the external world." (GA *20* 335/243) Indeed, quite similarly to Husserl, the world is the very condition for understanding another Dasein, a ground of comprehensibility – I'd say translatability – that makes distance, incomprehensibility and untranslatability possible.[30] Further, all natural and utilizable beings may be for the sake of human Dasein, but this does not mean that 'nature' exists for its use and purposes. And yet, the structure of transcendence is one belonging exclusively to the human Dasein: if the ground of the ontological difference is the transcendence of Dasein, then non-human living things will be deprived of a relation to the world 'as such,' an understanding of Being and the freedom to let beings be.[31]

What precisely does Heidegger mean by the 'freedom' to let beings be? "To put it briefly, Dasein's transcendence and freedom are identical!"[32] (GA *26* 238/185) To let beings be does not mean to abandon, renounce or neglect them, rather the opposite: "to let be is to engage oneself with beings... To let be – that is, to let beings be as the beings that they are – means to engage oneself with the open region and its openness into which every being comes to stand, bringing that openness, as it were, along with itself." (GA *9* 144/188) This process of emerging and 'standing-out-in-itself-from-itself' is precisely what Heidegger understands as *phusis* or 'nature,' the 'upsurgent presence' of beings as a whole.[33] Transcendence itself is determined as "freely letting world prevail [*freie Waltenlassen von Welt als Transzendenz*]."[34] (GA *9* 165/127) As I just showed, Dasein's proper relation to beings is understood by Heidegger as a purposive for-the-sake-of, distinguished from any notion of nature as something belonging to humans with which they can do as they please. The for-the-sake-of of beings is indeed the necessary correlate of a willing, but one that must be distinguished from its existentiell or ontic determination, and also from the opposition of an organic spontaneity to a mechanical compulsion.[35] Indeed, all 'ontological' willing for Heidegger is grounded in the letting that is the freedom and transcendence of Dasein.[36] Furthermore, freedom is not a property or possession of the human as something it 'has.' Rather, Dasein possesses the human and grants it alone the relation to beings as a whole, one denied to 'nature.'[37] But this freedom is itself inseparable from what Heidegger calls the binding counter-hold of the world.[38] Suspended between its excessive transcendence and

the counter-hold of the world, Dasein's freedom is revealed as its impotence and powerlessness. As Heidegger writes in *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*,

> in man's comportment towards beings which he himself is not, he already finds the being as that from which he is supported, as that on which he is dependent, as that over which, for all his culture and technology, he can never become master. Depending upon the being which he is not, man is at the same time not master of the being which he himself is. (GA *3* 228/155)

Dasein's powerlessness in its freedom, for Heidegger, can in fact be understood as the origin of responsibility.[39] In its transcendence, "Dasein is, in each case, beyond beings, as we say, but it is beyond in such a way that it, first of all, *experiences beings in their resistance*, against which transcending Dasein is powerless." (GA *26* 279/215) I showed above that Heidegger complicates the idea of material resistance as the correlate of organic striving in Scheler, faulting the latter for beginning with elementary forms of life and generalizing these to the human Dasein, suggesting that we can only begin any such reflections from the type of being we ourselves are. If, however, this transcendence of Dasein is exclusively conferred upon the human, as Derrida believes, it remains to be seen whether both this resistance and this powerlessness are thought in a sufficiently radical sense in Heidegger, and along with it the differentiation of 'letting' from its classical, humanist and voluntarist correlate. To anticipate my reading of Derrida, if one can somehow think an arche-material res(~~is~~)tance, older than the distinction between Being and beings holding sway in the *Walten* of *phusis*, one can orient oneself otherwise in thinking a powerlessness in death which would radically expropriate any transcendence proper to the human Dasein, which would in turn instil the hetero-affection of a material *restance* at the heart of its auto-affective temporalization, a res(~~is~~)tance that resists the ontological '*is*' at its heart, places Being under erasure, resisting all objectification, all the while making it possible.[40] As Heidegger writes, Dasein's powerlessness must be understood as originary; "it cannot be removed by reference to the conquest of nature, to technology, which rages about in the 'world' today like an unshackled beast; for this domination of nature is the real proof for the metaphysical powerlessness of Dasein, which can only attain freedom in history." (GA *26* 279/215)

§3.1.2: Letting Beings Be: Beyond the Economy of Eidos *and* Idea

In order to situate these thoughts in my elaboration of general ecology, let me recall Derrida's discussion of form, *morphè*, *eidos* and *idea* in chapters 1 and 2, one extending to Heideggerian ontology. In "Form and Fashion," Derrida entertains the thought that a common root of racism and anti-Semitism – I added anthropocentrism and other mutually reinforcing structures of domination – could be located in a fascination for form, visibility, the organic and organizing contour of an *eidos* and idealization, one that seems bound with the questions of objectification and calculative value I am discussing here.[41] I recognize, however, the immense difficulties involved in engaging such questions, especially that of anti-Semitism, with regard to Heidegger, and its spectre will haunt my next two chapters. For Heidegger, the shift from the thinking of Being as *phusis* to that of Being as *Idea*, the latter restricting the relation to beings solely in terms of production, calculation, objectification, indeed commerce can be traced to a certain inversion in relation between the original concept of *morphe* and the *eidos* – the form and the look – one in which Plato will come to interpret the materiality of beings as *me-on*, "that which really should not be and really *is* not either, because beings always deform the pure look, by actualizing it, insofar as they incorporate it into matter."[42] (GA *40* 140/196) For Heidegger, the relationship to beings as disposable and calculable objects itself manifests a certain understanding of Being in its everydayness, and by repeating this gesture, the one-sidedness of its viewpoint is revealed. All production requires something with which to produce, that does not itself need to be produced, something "offer[ing] resistance to the formative processes that produce things." (GA *24* 164/116) Therein lies the concept of matter, the *hylè*, of fundamental importance to the Greeks not due to their materialism, he notes, but because matter is necessary to the understanding of a being in productive comportment.[43] As I showed, Derrida is not only suspicious of any return to materialism that would solidify its binary opposition to form, but also of the corrective proposed by so-called material phenomenology, for reasons that Heidegger would no doubt share given the latter's own serious reservations before *Lebensphilosophie*: the trust material phenomenology places in the concepts of pure immanence, pure transcendental life, transcendental vitalism and so on.[44] Both material phenomenology and what one might call a 'biopolitical' calculative enframing seem in this sense to come down to one another.[45] Indeed, it is precisely in response to the dark historical connotations of these concepts of pure life and 'feeling oneself alive' that

Heidegger will resist the Nazi appropriation of Nietzsche's philosophy by reading the latter's thought as a metaphysics of life rather than a vitalism or biologism.[46]

It is rather through a reworking of intentionality as the ontological transcendence of Dasein and as fundamentally *affective* that Heidegger will short-circuit the debates between formalism/materialism, realism/idealism, subjectivism/objectivism, etc. Derrida will credit Heidegger for rethinking affectivity beyond the opposition of reason and sensibility.[47] As I showed in chapter 2, all consciousness is consciousness *of* something for Husserl; it intends towards beings. Heidegger's phenomenological reduction is not one of subjectively or immanently apprehending a being, but of understanding a being as it unconceals itself in its Being. Intentionality must thus be understood on the basis of the transcendence of Dasein.[48]

> intentionality is not an extant relation between an extant subject and an extant object but is constitutive of the relational character of the subject's comportment as such. As the structure of subject-comportment, it is not something immanent to the subject which would then need supplementation by a transcendence; instead, transcendence, and hence intentionality, belongs to the nature of the entity that comports itself intentionally. Intentionality is neither something objective nor something subjective. (GA *24* 446/313-4)

As I mentioned, Dasein's transcendence is understood by Heidegger as Being-in-the-world, and makes possible what Heidegger calls the 'ontic' transcendence of Husserlian intentionality.[49] Being-in involves letting beings be encountered, which is not simply sensing, visibly or otherwise, but involves what Heidegger calls circumspective and affective concern: the being encountered *matters* to Dasein.[50] But this becoming-affected by the resistance of beings is itself only possible in Dasein's structure as being-in-the-world; resistance presupposes world.[51]

> Under the strongest pressure and resistance, nothing like an affect would come about, and the resistance itself would remain essentially undiscovered, if Being-in-the-world with its state-of-mind, had not already submitted itself [*sich schon angewiesen*] to having entities within the world matter to it in a way which its moods have outlined in advance. *Existentially, a state-of-mind implies a disclosive submission to the world, out of which we can encounter something that matters to us*. (GA *2* 137/177)

Dasein's intentionality, then, "surrenders itself to the world and lets the world matter to it." (GA *2* 139/178) At the risk of resurrecting the played-out puns on mattering – materially and affectively – one can at least note a certain articulation between Dasein's in-Being and the beings with which it concerns itself. Heidegger warns, then, that intentionality must not be understood according to the traditional concepts of form and sensile matter, or the opposition of the

spontaneity of understanding and the receptivity of sensuousness, "an intellect which glues and rigs together the world's matter with its own forms." (GA *20* 96/70) What Heidegger understands as form or *morphè* is not the construct of a subjective act added to objects, but rather the 'being-in-itself,' and to constitute a being is not to produce, make or fabricate one, but means "*letting the entity be seen in its objectivity*."[52] (GA *20* 97/71)

The neglect of the question of Being and the misunderstanding of transcending Dasein as Being-in-the-world are for Heidegger themselves the reason behind all opposition of realism/idealism, materialism/formalism, objectivism/subjectivism.[53] These debates, underlying all contemporary epistemology, theory of knowledge and scientific practice are coextensive with a forgetting of the meaning of Being as a question, one that reduces all beings to their disposability for technicist calculability, use-value, their restricted economy. While the transcendence of Dasein and that of the world are not two separate beings and designate an originarily relational structure, "idealism and realism both let the relationship between subject and object first emerge." (GA *20* 225/166) Whether in idealism, where the subject creates the relationship to the object, or in realism, where the object effects the relation to the subject, both subject and object are separable.

Let me now attempt to tie together these reflections on Heidegger's radicalization of intentionality with my earlier adaptation of Derrida's critique of form as underlying what one could call the 'biopolitical' mechanisms responsible for environmental degradation. As I noted, all the problems of subject-object, inside-outside, etc., stem from forgetting the question of Being and misunderstanding the transcendence of Dasein; a forgetting and misunderstanding which are not accidental but belong to the very structure of Being, *phusis*. How did the covering-up of this meaning come about? I noted above that *phusis*, for Heidegger, means how something unfolds itself and comes into appearance, "*phusis* is Being itself, by virtue of which beings first become and remain *observable*." (GA *40* 11/15*e*) As he notes, *phusis* and *phainesthai* share the same etymological root concerning lighting up, self-showing and appearing. *Phusis*, then, is phenomenological through and through. In the original Greek sense of *morphè* and form, what becomes observable is what stands and places itself forth and enacts its limit. For the human observer, the *morphè* offers itself in terms of how it looks, which the Greeks call *eidos* or *idea*.

The degeneration from Greek thinking, in which humans now consider all beings as objects for their disposal and calculation, stems from the reduction of the *phainesthai* to the

visibility of things present-at-hand.[54] As appearing, *phusis* first offers a form, a *morphè*, which then grounds the look, the *eidos*, the *idea*. Appearing itself has these two meanings; on the one hand, and authentically so for Heidegger, *phusis* as form-appearing means "the self-gathering event of bringing itself to stand and thus standing in gatheredness." (GA *40* 139/194-5) On the other hand, *phusis* as idea-appearing means "as something that is already standing there, to proffer a foreground, a surface, a look as an offering to be looked at." (GA *40* 139/195) The end of Greek philosophy, however, is not so much that *phusis* becomes determined as *idea*, but that this becomes its sole and definitive interpretation. Greek philosophy thus "becomes a matter of schools, organizations, and techniques… when… the Being of being appears as *idea*, and as *idea* becomes the 'ob-ject' of *episteme* (scientific knowledge.)" (GA *40* 92/128) In fact, he writes, with Plato, the connection between *morphè* and *eidos* becomes reversed, and the latter comes to ground the former. The *eidos* serves as the model in view of which every forming production will orient itself. This comes to determine *phusis* as 'nature' as well, 'nature' being that which produces products which give themselves to the look for their use-value.[55]

To repeat, Heidegger does not see the determination of *phusis* as *idea* as accidental, this determination belongs to the definition of *phusis* as appearing, and to encounter beings in view of production occupies the majority of our everyday engagement with them. Shaping, forming, making and producing in view of the look/eidos/idea are basic comportments of the Dasein, and "are now handled like well-worn coins," they belong to our economy, indeed constitute it. (GA *24* 152/108) However, in the necessary repetition of this relationship to beings, something like an understanding of Being does begin to disclose itself. Productive comportment for Heidegger must necessarily understand its activity as eventually finished, and in this finishing, extricated from any teleology, productive comportment releases the being from its activity and lets it be in-itself. Standing on its own as finished, not only is the product "no longer bound to the productive relation, but also, even as something still to be produced, it is understood beforehand as intended to be released from this relation." (GA *24* 160/113) This originary relation of discharge and setting-free, indeed of letting beings be, in which Dasein "comports itself in such a way that it even *desists from all commerce* [Hantieren] with the being, from occupation with it" is obfuscated by what Heidegger calls the theory of knowledge and the false debates it engenders. (GA *24* 167/118*e*)

One might imagine, given these reflections, that the hesitations faced by Derrida in "Form and Fashion" concerning what I have just called the biopolitics of form have less to do with form itself than with the *eidos* and ideality determining how a thing should look, if the thing fits, and so on. If Heidegger is correct in his radicalization of intentionality as the transcendence of Dasein that form, *morphè* in its original sense coheres more with letting the thing show itself as it shows itself in its affective materiality, one in fact finds therein a gentle resistance to biopolitical enframing.[56] Of course, the objectification of beings in view of production and calculation that lends its rhythm to classical science, language and man's domination over nature is not something that can be theorized away; such a relation belongs to the very definition of *phusis*. But, as I've hinted throughout, the freedom to let beings be would be one exclusively conferred upon the human for Heidegger on Derrida's reading, as would be the stepping back from economic enframing and valuation. But as I've stressed, my intention is not to return whatever has been reserved for the human to the forms of life that have been denied it, or at least not primarily so. Rather, general ecology not only thinks this restricted circular propriation, but its radical expropriation; general ecology thinks the two together in what Derrida calls ex-appropriation. However, my engagement with Heidegger is far from complete, as I have yet to examine the crucial issues of ecstatic and auto-affective temporalization, finitude and death and how these play into the above discussions. Affective concern, Heidegger writes, is having the mode of being of "pure *letting-become-present* – a remarkable kind of being which is understood only when it is seen that *making present and appresenting is notion other than time itself*." (GA *20* 292/213-4) Closing the discussion of *eidos* and *morphè* with the following:

> the thing to see is this. In the intentional structure of production there is implicit reference to something, by which this something is understood as not bound to or dependent on the subject but, inversely, as released and independent. In terms of fundamental principle, we encounter here an extremely peculiar transcendence of the Dasein…which, as will appear, is possible only on the basis of temporality. (GA *24* 161/114)

§3.1.3: Death, Time and Powerlessness

Let us recall Derrida's claim, perhaps striking to Heidegger scholars, that the latter's entire philosophical project along with Levinas's begins with a certain challenge to the Husserlian Living Present.[57] This claim is particularly interesting since nowhere in the readings discussed does Heidegger make reference to the *lebendige Gegenwart* by name. However, Heidegger goes to great lengths to distance phenomenology as he understands it from a philosophy of life, as I

have just shown evidenced in his radicalization of Husserlian intentionality and the immanence to consciousness of 'lived experience,' [*Erlebnis*] as the transcendence of Dasein, challenging the Pure Form of the Living Present as the unique and absolute condition of possibility of all experience. The transcendence of Dasein reintroduces the world at the heart of its affective relation to beings-as-a-whole, *phusis*. What seems to interest Derrida so much in Heidegger's reading of Western metaphysics, however, is that the latter does not attempt to simply seek a beyond of metaphysics, of the Living Present, as if the tradition could somehow be overcome and done away with. Rather, it is Heidegger's soliciting of what Derrida calls 'philosophical invulnerability' of the Living Present, the structural impossibility of exiting the Living Present that Heidegger's destruction of metaphysics begins to shake up. As I mentioned, a specifically Heideggerian reading of the Living Present occupies Derrida's entire early work; from the necessity of dialectically reconciling Husserlian phenomenology with ontology in *The Problem of Genesis*... to the thought of transcendental difference at the heart of the Living Present in the final pages of the *Introduction.*[58] As I argued in chapter 2, however, these moves only accomplished what I called the restricted ecology in Derrida's work. Indeed, the questions of authentic temporalization in ecstasis and auto-affection, death and finitude – insofar as they can be shown to be the sole property and propriety of the human Dasein – will also restrict Heidegger's thought to the propriative circulation of a restricted ecology. But to think the ex-propriation of these structures, those at the heart of any appropriation, will perhaps allow us to think the philosophical *vulnerability* of the Living Present otherwise, the *impossibility* of its exit otherwise, beyond the simple overpowering of the human Dasein in its transcendence towards *phusis* in the finitude of the time, Being, history, sense, experience and life we share with all living beings on Earth, perhaps even the infinite finitude of this finitude itself.

Before inscribing Derrida's Heideggerian reflections in the logic of general ecology, let me return to *Being and Time*, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* and *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology.* For Heidegger, temporality is the sole basis for transcending Dasein's releasement of beings from productive comportment: its letting beings be. I showed that Heidegger opposes what he calls the ontic/existentiell transcendence of intentionality to that of Dasein, whose relation to beings and to itself is one of care and concern. Temporality for Heidegger is the ontological meaning of this care, indeed of Dasein itself. To say that Dasein comports itself in care is to say that Dasein is concerned with its possibilities, and for Heidegger,

Dasein's ownmost and most proper possibility is its death, one it has to take over in each case and cannot be outstripped; the possibility of its impossibility of being-there.[59] The anticipation of death ultimately individuates Dasein as its ownmost, non-relational possibility. But do we understand this anticipation of death as one merely off in the future, a 'not yet' that every form of life eventually encounters?[60] From the viewpoint of biology and physiology for Heidegger, this seems to be the case. Plants and animals eventually *perish* [*Verenden*].[61] However, opposed to this inauthentic interpretation of death is the authentic being-towards-death of the human Dasein in its resoluteness [*Entschlossenheit*].[62] Dasein's death is not simply 'not yet,' but "has the character of something *towards which* Dasein *comports itself*. The end is impending [*steht… bevor*] for Dasein." (GA *2* 250/293) In authentic being-towards-death, Dasein chooses its ownmost potentiality for Being, a possibility it has nonetheless inherited before any willing on its part and which can never be done away with.[63]

Suspended between choice and inheritance, resoluteness must not be understood as the wilful or heroic activity of a subject before a situation, its 'taking action' in productive comportment. As resolute, Dasein is always already taking action, in a situation. However, "the term 'take action' [*Handeln*] is one which we are purposely avoiding. For in the first place this term must be taken so broadly that 'activity' [*Aktivität*] will also embrace *the passivity of resistance*." (GA *2* 300/347) Resolute anticipation thus also involves powerlessness, granting death a power over Dasein's existence.[64] As Heidegger elaborates,

> if Dasein, by anticipation, lets death become powerful in itself, then, as free for death, Dasein understands itself in its own *superior power*, the power of its finite freedom, so that in that freedom, which 'is' only in its having chosen to make a choice, it can take over the *powerlessness* of abandonment to its having done so. (GA *2* 384/436)

This ability or capacity to come towards and stand before itself for Dasein is thus also a letting itself come towards itself, and the being-ahead-of-itself in resolute anticipation is precisely what Heidegger calls care. *Temporality* is the ontological meaning of care because Dasein's coming to itself in its authentic being-towards-death is grounded in the future as coming towards.[65] The essence of futurity, he writes in *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, is this character of *coming-toward oneself* [Auf-sich-zukommen].[66] As such, futural Dasein comes towards itself as *having-been*.[67] Along with futurity and having-been, the temporal structure of care also holds towards Dasein's everyday comportment towards beings which are ready-at-hand; it lets beings show themselves in their Being by making them present.[68]

Futurity, making-present or empresenting, and having-been: these designate what Heidegger calls the *ecstases* of temporalization. Temporality "is not an entity. It is not, but it *temporalizes* itself." (GA *2* 328/377) As this self-temporalization, it is "the *ekstatikon* pure and simple. *Temporality is the primordial 'out-side-of-itself' in and for itself*."[69] (GA *2* 329/377) If such a description recalls Derrida's own reworking of the Husserlian Living Present in the final pages of the *Introduction*, let us further supplement this reading with Heidegger's discussion of what Derrida will call auto-affection. In *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, Heidegger recalls that the pure intuition of time must always affect the representation of objects, but is not a being at-hand that comes from outside to affect these representations. Rather, time is a pure intuition that allows Dasein to take things in stride and to let beings be. As pure auto-affection,

> time is not an acting affection that strikes a self which is at hand. Instead, as pure it forms the essence of something like a self-activating. However, if it belongs to the essence of the finite subject to be able to be activated as a self, then time as pure self-affection forms the essential structure of subjectivity. Only on the grounds of this selfhood can the finite creature be what it must be: dependent on taking-things-in-stride." (GA *3* 189/129)

Pure self- or auto-affection is for Heidegger "the innermost essence of transcendence." (GA *3* 190/130) The ecstases of time are not exteriorities towards which primordial time would then exit; as pure auto-affection, temporality temporalizes itself in its ecstases.[70] As the transcendence of Dasein must likewise not be understood as the relation between an inside and an outside, a derivative relation with respect to its transcendence as Being-in-the-world, "if Dasein's Being is completely grounded in temporality, then temporality must make possible Being-in-the-world and therewith Dasein's transcendence; the transcendence in turn provides the support for concernful Being alongside entities within-the-world." (GA *2* 364/415)

For Heidegger the ecstases of time must not be understood as pure raptures, but always in relation to certain horizons that constitute the very possibility of world.[71] The world is already disclosed and presupposed within ecstatico-horizonal temporalization. As I hinted at the beginning of my investigation, the ontological possibility of letting entities be encountered and objectified within-the-world must be understood in the ecstatico-horizonal transcendence of the world. Beyond the derivative distinctions between subject and object, the possibility of Dasein's meaningful intentional relationship to entities within the transcendent world can be explained thusly: on the one hand, because Dasein's being-in-the-world is grounded in its own temporalization, the world is subjective. On the other hand, since the world is temporally

transcendent, its objectivity is beyond that of any object.[72] Inasmuch as Dasein exists, it is "further outside than any object and at the same time further inside, more inward (more subjective), than any subject or soul (because temporality as transcendence is openness)."[73] (GA *24* 359-60/255) Because transcendence is itself the finite structure of any relation to beings, in a statement that ought give pause to any proponent of object-oriented ontology, Heidegger notes that "it is not necessary, in order to escape an alleged 'subjective idealism,' to invoke a 'turn to the Object' – a turn which is praised again today all too noisily and with all too little understanding of the problem." (GA *3* 73/49)

As pure auto-affection, as the pure outside-of-itself in-and-for-itself in the unity of its ecstases, temporalization constitutes the transcendence of Dasein, as Being-in-the-world, and its capacity to let beings be and to take things in stride. To say that time is the condition of letting beings be in their Being, to let them Be *as such* in the difference from their being is another way of saying that authentic temporalization is the ground for the understanding of Being.[74] Moreover, temporalization functions as the possibility of both Dasein's authentic and inauthentic relation to death, since it constitutes Dasein in its originary finitude. Indeed, Heidegger notes, authentic temporality must itself be understood as finite; infinite time is the inauthentic levelling of primordial temporality. This finitude of time is also that of Dasein, and furthermore that of its knowledge.[75] Indeed, as Heidegger puts it in the *Kantbuch*, "finite intuition of the being cannot give the object from out of itself. It must allow the object to be given. Not every intuition as such, but rather only the finite, is intuition that 'takes things in stride.' Hence, the character of the finitude of intuition is found in its receptivity." (GA *3* 26/17) Transcendence, Heidegger writes, "is finitude itself, so to speak." (GA *3* 91/62) The auto-affection of time, anterior to any experience, sensibility or empirical receiving allows the finite human Dasein to be open to that which it is not, to the *wholly other* [ganz anderen], something "that the knowing creature itself is not and over which it is not the master," and lets it be encountered as standing-against.[76] (GA *3* 115/79) In the ecstatico-horizonal temporality of concern, "Dasein understand[s] itself in its abandonment to a 'world' of which it never becomes master." (GA *2* 356/407) In short, time functions as the condition of possibility of experience itself, and no knowledge of the being that it is not and can never master can be said to be more disempowering than the relation of Dasein to its death, the impossibility of its being-there, the possibility of its impossibility. To put a pertinent question far too succinctly, if the human delimitations of all these reflections were to

find themselves complicated in a certain logic of ex-appropriation, could one not think this powerlessness before death as the original expropriation of the human, as the originary finitude of life differentially shared [*partagée*] by all living beings? Indeed, can this non-power be thought even further in the resistance of materiality itself? As Heidegger himself puts it in *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*,

> only something that is capable, and remains capable, is alive. Something which is no longer capable, irrespective of whether a capacity is used or not, is no longer alive. Something which does not exist in the manner of being capable cannot be dead either. The stone is never dead because its being is not a being capable in the sense of what is instinctual or subservient. 'Dead matter' is a meaningless concept. Being capable is not the possibility of the organism as distinct from something actual, but is a constitutive moment of the way in which the animal as such *is* – of its being. (GA *29-30* 343/236)

But rather than the corrective which posits the agency, dynamism and liveliness of matter so prevalent in new materialism, could one not think materiality as a dead and expropriating powerlessness before and beyond the opposition of capacity and incapacity, power and powerlessness? To think not only the hetero-affective alterity and transcendence of a worldly and material res(is)tance at the heart of the purity of the restricted ecology of this auto-affection of life, but to think impossibility and experience together, in an experience *without* experience, an 'unexperienced experience' of the impossible? When Derrida writes, for example, that "exteriority is inanimate," but this death, which is also space and nature, inscribes itself at the heart of human living presence. (DG 280/196) As Krell wonders, if both Dasein and Being are finite, and thus so must also be the horizon of the question of Being, "how can a *transcendental* horizon, conceived ontologically as an a priori condition-of-possibility, be finite?"[77] As quasi- or ultra-transcendental, I'd reply, as having its condition of possibility in its own impossibility, in an impossibility older than the ontological difference. As Derrida concludes his seminar on Heidegger, this calls for thinking a destruction, indeed a deconstruction.

> It is accomplished slowly, patiently, it patiently takes hold of the whole of language, of science, of the human, of the world. And this patience is not even ours, it is not an ethical virtue. It is the auto-affection of what one can no longer even call Being. Being and history would thus still be metaphorical expressions. (Destroy the word *metaphor* = linguistics. Heidegger does not use it. (HQ 325/224)

To think life death on earth otherwise, beyond the name, ontic metaphor, question, as response, promise – this is perhaps the task of deconstruction as general ecology.

§3.2: Derrida and Ex-Appropriation

§3.2.1: The Destruktion of the Living Present

In a 1967 interview, Derrida writes that nothing in his work would have been possible without Heidegger, particularly with respect to the difference between Being and beings, the ontological difference.[78] But he quickly adds here, and out of fidelity to this debt, the necessity of confirming a certain metaphysical belonging of the ontological difference.[79] As I showed, the final stage of what I called Derrida's restricted ecology consists of thinking a transcendental difference, I believe in a Heideggerian sense, at the heart of the Living Present.[80] In fact, the distance Derrida comes to take from Heidegger corresponds to the degree to which the restricted ecology of the Living Present becomes rearticulated within a more general structure. Again, this occurs in problematizing a movement of propriety, economic reappropriation without remainder, auto-affective circulation and immanent self-presence. It does so by revealing, as their condition of possibility *and* as their structural impropriety and expropriation, what I have called the transcendences of the alterity of the wholly other: the past which has never been present, the pre-historical, radical passivity, the vulnerability of finitude and death differentially shared by all living beings, the res(is)tance of materiality, etc. General ecology, then, must be understood as the stricture binding together these transcendences with the restricted ecologies of the transcendence of Dasein, Being-with-others, Being-in-the-world, *phusis*, being-towards-death, the ontological difference, and so on.

To understand these remarks in the context of my examination of Husserl, let's see how Derrida presents Heidegger's thinking in relation to phenomenology in a series of lectures held in 1964-5: *Heidegger: The Question of Being and History*. In chapter 2, I'd examined the transcendental sense of history understood by Husserl to have lain dormant in confusion and darkness in animality and in the most elementary forms of life, and then irrupting upon Greek humanity as the prescription of an infinite task in view of producing the infinitely transmissible and translatable truths of science, mathematics and ultimately phenomenology. As I showed above, however, Heidegger's first and primary criticism of Husserl, grounding all his others, concerns phenomenology's strict adherence to a classical *subjectivism*, the *subjectum* understood as substance, *hupokeimenon*, a being ready-to-hand, and the essential link of these determinations to technicizing calculation. Second, this subjectivism is essentially connected to a *humanism*, despite Husserl's attempt to distance the transcendental ego from any anthropologism.

> 'humanity,' here is still the name of the being to which the transcendental *telos* – determined as Idea (in the Kantian sense) or even as Reason – is announced. It is man as *animal rationale* who, in his most classical metaphysical determination, designates the site of the unfolding of teleological reason, that is to say history... reason is history, and there is no history but of reason. The latter functions in every man, as *animal rationale*, no matter how primitive he is. (MP 146/122*t*)

Third, this teleology understands its task as the infinite transmission of the truths of *science*, the univocal production of ideal objects, one Heidegger associates with their calculability and use-value. Fourth, Husserl's concept of the *Lebenswelt* relies on a derivative opposition of nature and culture and cannot think *phusis*. Finally, fifth, Husserl's thinking of history still belongs to what Heidegger calls the age of the world-picture.[81] As Derrida explains, the determination of *phusis* as *eidos* from Plato to Husserl is itself the condition of the world becoming an image, picture and object. The great epoch of 'world' thus overflows all differences between cultures and time periods as the destiny of Europe, finding its ultimate fulfillment for Heidegger in a contemporary science and technology that determines the world as an object available for action, conception, calculability and predictability. Husserl thus thinks history as the subjectivist and humanist project of the infinite transmission of the truths of science, according to a derivative opposition of nature and culture, in a metaphysical world-picture that unites all of humanity towards the calculative and objectifying power of science and technology. Heidegger's project, however, does not consist of wishing to escape this world, its epoch or the project of science and technology.[82] Rather, he will show that the epoch of Western metaphysics "escapes from itself, that it is not simply one with itself and that already a shadow divides it from itself, through which its present meaning appears to it and its future is announced. A certain relation to the incalculable is the shadow that allows the motif of calculability to be thought as what it is." (HQ 201/133)

Derrida proposes to show that Heidegger's destruction of classical subjectivity is grounded on the historicity of Dasein.[83] If I skipped over the question of historicity in my engagements with Heidegger, it was not only to avoid overly complicating the above analysis but to give it here its proper due. In *Being and Time*, the finitude of temporality is explained by Heidegger as the hidden basis for Dasein's historicality, the latter simply being a more concrete analysis of temporality.[84] Why then, does history hold such importance for Derrida in the mid-sixties, and how does this fit in with his previous work on Husserl? As the former explains, the question of Dasein's historicity is not primary in *Being and Time*, and needs to be thought both

with respect to its being-in-the-world and its temporalization. How does Heidegger's thought of world, time and thereby history differ from Husserl's for Derrida?

As I noted above above, Heidegger is quite critical both of transcendental idealism and the *Epokhe* of *Ideas I*, which he argues would give way to an egological lived experience absolutely independent from the existence of the world itself, an ideal absolute subjectivity that can in fact withstand the absolute annihilation of the world. The *epokhè* leads to an an-historical and a-temporal *ego* for Heidegger, who for his part cannot abide a thought of the absolute independence of subjectivity with respect to a world.[85] Conversely then, Heidegger's project of the destruction of classical subjectivity consists in affirming the historicity and temporality of Dasein. Derrida suggests here that all the difficulties encountered in Husserl's C-manuscripts concerning temporalization, the alter ego and the *hylè*, after the publication of *Being and Time*, force Husserl to return to "that pre-egological and anonymous stratum of lived experience where temporality is constituted and constitutes the *ego*." (HQ 186/122) As I also showed, Heidegger radicalizes the transcendental reduction beyond the immanence of subjective lived experience: the transcendental reduction is insufficiently transcendental. The subjective and egological dimension of experience must itself be bracketed and revealed as derivative with respect to the more originary transcendence of Dasein. Dasein's transcendence as Being-in-the-world is not only inextricable from the world but is the very structure by which the world worlds itself [*weltet*] in its radical historicity. The transcendence of Dasein, for Derrida, thus points to a more originary dimension of existence than the *cogito*, the 'I think,' consciousness or the *ego*.[86] A similar gesture, he adds, can be found in Sartre when the latter discusses the pre-subjective or pre-egological transcendental field, as I discussed in chapters 1 and 2, where I also showed Derrida's return to this question in 'Eating Well.'[87] I also evoked Deleuze and Guattari's reference to this notion in *What is Philosophy*, which faults Husserl for misrepresenting its immanence as transcendence-within-immanence.[88] Conversely, one might say that the Husserlian notion of the ego as transcendence-in-immanence is insufficiently transcendent for Heidegger.

In radicalizing the transcendental reduction, Heidegger attempts to deconstruct and solicit the irreducible and absolute egological form of experience that is the Living Present for Derrida.[89] In bracketing the world, Husserlian phenomenology cannot think transcendental history or temporality. Rather, history must be understood in Dasein's transcendence as Being-in-the-world, a Being-in, which Derrida recalls, is not of the immanence of *Vorhandensein*, the

being present-at-hand for scientific and technological calculability. What does Derrida mean by the solicitation of the irreducible? Let's recall from chapter 2 that it is impossible for one to exit within the Living Present, one is powerless to do so. However, it is also impossible to remain within the purity of its indivisibility; the Living Present gives itself to be thought in terms of an originary difference.[90] This seems to cohere entirely with the discussion of ecstatic and auto-affective temporality discussed above. But does Derrida not allow us to think this impossibility and powerlessness otherwise? For Heidegger, the continuity of life [*Zusammenhang des Lebens*] is thought as a certain transcendental permanence, unifying the permanence of the self with the privileging of the present. "In this sequence of Experiences, what is 'really' 'actual' is, in each case, just that Experience which is present-at-hand [Derrida remarks here on Heidegger's depiction of the *Erlebnis* as *Vorhandene*] 'in the current now.'" (GA *2* 373/425) What Heidegger is describing is precisely for Derrida the Living Present, in which both phenomenology and, he adds, existentialism take presence [*Vorhandenheit*] and present lived experience [*vorhandene Erlebnis*] as "the very form of real, authentic, effective, full experience. One must understand that Heidegger must destroy or shake up this absolute privilege of the Present and the Presence of the Present to rediscover the possibility of historicity." (HQ 209/138*t*) It is necessary, he adds, to understand here the philosophical *invulnerability* of the Living Present. "Why invulnerable? Well it is evident, it is self-evidence itself that any experience is only ever lived in the *present* and that everything of experience that comes about, everything that appears in it, presents itself in it, as meaning or as self-evidence, is present." (HQ 210/139) Any experience, whether in our time, across the entire history of humanity, in time in general or millions of years in the future, human, animal or divine will be in the present.

> An assertion that is perhaps trivial but irrecusable: *we never leave the Present*. Life – life in the sense in which life is the opening of the difference that allows appearing – life, animal life or the life of consciousness, life in general (and people have tried to say that Husserlianism is a philosophy of life...) – life is living only in the present and the Living Present is a tautological expression in which in any case one cannot tell a subject from a predicate. Ultimate foundation of our being-together. (HQ 139-40/210)

I argued in chapter 2 that for any living organism, the Living Present maintains together the flux of the retention of past-presents and the protention of future-presents, and that the opening to these pasts and futures is itself the Present. The absolute form of the Living Present was shown not only to constitute the possibility of any experience but any evidence, and thus any scientific

and historical knowledge and their universally translatable languages. The possibility of reactivating the truths of science and assuring their infinite univocal transmissibility has the Living Present as its foundation.[91]

It is thus the pure temporality of the Living Present that must therefore be destructed to accede to the transcendence of Dasein in its originary historicity. The infinite, eternal and an-historical Living Present would be constituted by a vulgar concept of time for Heidegger, to which he would oppose an authentic, finite temporality. To affirm the originarily essential finitude of temporality would necessitate a temporalization that does not reduce history, death or indeed birth for Derrida.[92] Again, this inauthentic thought of history, time and death is not an accident or fault in apprehending authentic temporality but a necessary movement in the history of Being.[93] The impossibility of thinking life in general outside the pure form of the Living Present, the unsurpassibility of the Living Present, therefore, allows us to gain a certain glimpse of what has not and could not be thought otherwise, but more precisely,

> in the thought of the impossibility of the otherwise, in this *non-otherwise* is produced a certain difference, a certain trembling, a certain decentring that is not the position of another centre. Another centre would be another now; on the contrary, this *displacement* would not envisage an *absence*, which is to say another presence: it would *replace* nothing. (MP 41-2/38*t*)

To think the presence of the present is thus, for Derrida, to affirm its finitude, because "it also consists in affirming the impossibility of getting out of the present – history being born of this impossibility of living, this impossibility for an experience to happen other than in the form of the present." (HQ 216/144) This entails that, for Heidegger as well, the historical and teleological end of man can only be explicated on the basis of its end in mortal finitude.[94] "The name of man has always been inscribed in metaphysics between these two ends [the mortal and teleological]." (MP 147/123) Against the metaphysical, subjective and humanist determination of transcendental subjectivity and its classical attributes of activity, freedom and volition, the auto-affection of time at the heart of the Living Present allows us to describe the originary passivity of Dasein, the passive affection of time by itself as the basis from which all determinations of subjectivity are derivative: "a certain irreducible passivity of ek-sistence and *Da-sein*. Passivity, nucleus of passivity, which must not be understood on the model of thingly intra-worldliness or as sensibility, but at the very least as auto-affection of time by itself." (HQ 250/169) As Derrida reminds us, auto-affection *is* the transcendence of Dasein, "the notion of affectivity is at bottom

merely the name of the transcendence of *Dasein* toward the Being of beings, and as time, the meaning of the transcendental horizon of the question of Being. Affectivity is in this sense transcendence." (HQ 267/181)

As is well known, Heidegger argues that humanism, subjectivity and metaphysics are indissociable, and that the question of Being remains unthought in the ethics and ontology of humanism.[95] Derrida is hugely recognizant of his debt to what he calls Heidegger's arche-ethical gestures in *Being and Time*.[96] Both share a profound suspicion of any *Lebensphilosophie*, and it is against any philosophy of life, biologistic or organicist interpretation of the subject that Heidegger defines Dasein as a mortal existant rather than as a living being. What Heidegger wishes to precisely *deconstruct* is the idea of the human as a living being rather than a mortal being and its experience as *Erlebnis*, lived experience.[97] This entire rejection of *Leben und Erleben*, Derrida writes in *The Beast and the Sovereign,* is also a critique of Husserl,

> and phenomenology that determines its phenomenological absolute as *Erlebnis*, as life, transcendental life; *Leben und Erleben*; if he adds *und Erleben*, it's because he has in mind, he's taking critical aim at, the determination of Being as life, the human absolute as living, and thereby phenomenology as a philosophy of life, of transcendental life. Which I had also tried to question long ago. (BS2 185n1/124n19)

All ontologies of life and metaphysics of death would be constituted on a pre-comprehension of death. Heidegger's task in the existential analytic of Dasein is thus to make this pre-comprehension explicit. Dasein's most proper property is the resolute anticipation of its death as the possibility of its impossibility. Again, this anticipation is not a heroic thought of surviving or overcoming death. In fact, Derrida suggests that Heidegger's resoluteness must be radically differentiated from Hegel's restricted economy. In my discussion of Bataille, I'd shown that the risk of death in the dialectic of mastery is simply a necessary movement of dialectical *mediation*, a passage, Derrida writes, "from life to life, first of all... life is *essential* and it must be *preserved by living it*, preserved by living it in the *Aufhebung*: i.e., in a negation that is not abstract." (HQ 291/199-200) The dialectic for Derrida comes down to thinking death "within the horizon of the infinite and the parousia of absolute knowledge, which is pure *life*, life with itself of consciousness." (HQ 292/200) In other words, Derrida writes, as "mediation of the *economy without loss of meaning*." (HQ 292/200*e*) How this thought will square with that of death as propriation and proper propriety of the human remains to be seen.

Resolute anticipation is an authentic possibility – from which Dasein can always default – to constitute the present as the past of a future; to live the present not as the origin and absolute form of experience but rather as something derivative with respect to an unsurpassable death anticipated from a finite future-to-come.[98] This anticipation of death is explained by the structure of Dasein's ex-tension (*Er-streckung*) between its birth and death. This ex-tension, Derrida notes, is not that of an individual subject or consciousness. The fact that death is always mine, its *Jemeinigkeit* or mineness, is constituted from Dasein's Being-towards-death. In the authentic anticipation of death, "I find myself as already being in death, affected to a world, and originarily a being amongst others. Being in death-with-others." (HQ 279/191*t*) Dasein does not itself constitute this structure of being-towards-death with others, but rather designates a *Mitsein* in death as an originary existential structure. But who are these others with which we are towards death? "For the moment we do not know." (HQ 221/147) The ex-tension between life and death holds as much for an individual, an intersubjective community, and humanity, all of which are eventual and secondary determinations of Dasein for Heidegger.

But the 'we' who are together in our finitude and anticipation of death are also together in a pre-comprehension of Being as those for whom Being is a question. The history of metaphysics, for Heidegger, consists of a pre-determination of Being as presence, present-being and thus the forgetting of the difference between Being and beings, the ontico-ontological difference. However, this forgetting is not accidental; since Being and Time are nothing outside of their determination as present beings, Being for Heidegger is transcendence plain and simple [*das Transcendens schlechthin*], the 'ontic metaphor' will have always been necessary to speak of Being.[99] The question of Being is thus irreducibly tied to language, but a language that must not be thought as the property of a human subject among others. As Heidegger famously writes, "Language is the house of Being," Being produces itself in its proximity to Dasein as language.[100] (GA *9* 313/239) In language, Dasein is the being for which Being is ontically the most proximate, but ontologically the most distant. But language also constitutes Dasein's capacity to *let beings be* what they are; Dasein's freedom is the movement of its transcendence from beings to the Being of beings, and Being produces itself *as such* in the question.

Much in Derrida's reading of Heidegger rests on this determination of the proximity of Dasein to the question of being and the correlated values of propriety, the proper of man, re-appropriation, authenticity, the *Eigen* of the *Ereignis* and especially the *oikos, oikonomia*.

Despite Heidegger's express intentions to the contrary, "it remains that man... the *proper of man* – the thinking of the proper of man is inseparable from the question or the truth of Being." (MP 148/124) The privilege of Dasein's proximity to Being in fact repeats the phenomenological principle of principles, the necessity of self presence, of our own self-proximity in the question of Being as it manifests itself to the Being that 'we' are, and is perhaps not so different, Derrida suggests, than the subjective consciousness of transcendental phenomenology. "Dasein, though *not* man, is nevertheless *nothing other* than man," but rather the necessary repetition of humanist metaphysical determinations in their destruction. (MP 151/127) But Derrida sees this privilege of proximity as a ubiquitous gesture in Heidegger; despite the ontological distance of Being to Dasein, everything appears to hinge on the necessity of reducing this distance. Derrida finds that in Heidegger's destruction of the metaphysics of presence we are inevitably recalled to the values of the proper, propriety, propriation and reappropriation that are inextricable from the authenticity [*Eigentlichkeit*] of Dasein's ownmost relation to Being. "Being is *what is near* to man, and... man is *what is near* to Being. The near is the proper ; the proper is the nearest (*propre, proprius)*. Man is the proper of Being... Being is the proper of man." (MP 160/133) What is taking place today, Derrida writes in "The Ends of Man," is a certain shaking of the security and economy of this propriety of humanity, its *oikonomia*, perhaps I'd say a certain ex-propriation of its self-relation within the stricture of a more general ecology.

§3.2.2: Ethical Transcendence, Non-Real Resistance and Letting Life Life-On

As with his treatment of Husserl, what interests Derrida in Levinas's reading of Heidegger is its attempt to think the impossible beyond of the Greek origin of the question, its ex-propriation, one might say, which enjoins an unassumable responsibility before something more ancient. Like the past that has never been present resisting the dialectic of the Living Present, Levinas points in Heidegger's discourse to something anterior to the question of Being that I'll later examine as the *Zusage*, acquiescence and affirmation. The responsibility entailed therein is impossible, but has already occurred with respect to the question and the totality of beings; it is an ethical imperative radically anterior to any ethical law, I'd also say to any positing of value.[101] Ethics is as anterior to Heideggerian ontology as it is to Greek thought in general for Levinas.[102] Within the Greek language – that of the metaphysics of presence – his thought enjoins us to depart from the Greek towards its other.[103] The Greek origin enduring in phenomenology and ontology will have always

consisted of the domination of the Same and the One, the violence of light and the *phainesthai*, the reduction of ethics and the foreclosure of ethical transcendence. Levinas wishes to free himself from this phenomenological violence by calling forth a non-violent relation to the infinite alterity of the other.[104] Heideggerian transcendence, Being-in-the-world, as Dasein, as the relation to the question of Being, the pre-comprehension of the meaning of Being, access to the ontological difference, to the as-such – all of these would fail ethical transcendence. Levinas's ethical imperative, 'thou shalt not kill,' however "marks the limit of all power, of all violence, and the origin of the ethical." (ED 154/130) Levinasian transcendence seems to think an absolute limitation on power, an absolute disempowerment. The face of the other limits my power, but not by opposing a counter-force, counter-power or counter-violence to my own; it speaks and looks at me "from an *other* origin of the world, from that which no finite power can restrict: the strange, unthinkable notion of *non-real resistance*." (ED 154/130) Anterior to the opposition of between the intelligible and the sensible, Levinas will speak in *Totality and Infinity* of an '*ethical resistance.*' Transcendence in Levinas's sense will thus attempt to free this resistance from the light of Being and the phenomenon.[105] For Levinas, Heideggerian ontology remains bound to the very dichotomies it critiques: the phenomenological violence of light commands the oppositions of inside/outside, subject/object as their unveiling, comprehension and indeed pre-comprehension. Heidegger's ecstatico-horizonal temporalization is not really transcendence, its ecstases simply those from an interiority to an exteriority.[106] In the pre-comprehension of the Being of beings, Heideggerian ontology ultimately remains an egology for Levinas, subordinating the relation to the other, who is *a being,* to the relation to Being, which permits its impersonal apprehension and domination in a relation of knowledge.[107] The thought of Being for Levinas thus comes down to a thought of possibility, power and violence.

As Derrida points out, however, one cannot speak of a priority of Being over beings, given that Being is itself nothing outside of beings, no more therefore than one can speak of the subordination of the ethical relation to the ontological relation. The thought of Being, he adds, is not a thought of power; power and priority can only exist as relations between beings. Derrida here recalls certain claims from Heidegger's "Letter on Humanism"; the thought of Being is neither ethics nor ontology, it has no results, no effects and exerts no power. In fact, not only is the thought of Being not ethical violence, but it seems that no ethics – in Levinas's sense – can be opened without it; the thought of Being conditions the respect of the other as other for

Derrida.[108] Dasein, as I showed, can only let be or take-in-stride that which it itself is not, that over which it is not master. To let the other be in the essence of its alterity requires the thought of Being. "Without this, no letting-be would be possible, and first of all, the letting be of the respect and the ethical commandment addressing itself to freedom. Violence would reign to such a degree that it could no longer even appear to itself and be named." (ED 202-3/172*t*) Since Being itself is nothing, the ontic metaphor will have always been necessary to speak of it. Similarly, one can only address oneself to the other in a language that comprehends the sense of Being, that is to say, in the question. But since one can only let be that which one is not, the very relation of letting be determines Being as the alterity of the other par excellence. Levinas thus necessitates the thought of Being and the ontic metaphor in his own discourse: ethical transcendence presupposes ontological transcendence.[109] Both transcendences would thus be practicing the same meta-physics, if *meta* means going beyond *phusis* as the totality of beings. This 'ontological' transcendence towards beings, Derrida writes, "inhabits and founds language, and along with it the possibility of all being-together; the possibility of a *Mitsein* much more original than any of the eventual forms with which it has been confused: solidarity, the team, companionship." (ED 217/183) As the very possibility of letting beings be, the thought of Being is thus as close to nonviolence as possible for Derrida. As I showed in chapter 2, however, this economy of violence is not pure nonviolence, since pure nonviolence comes down to pure violence.[110] Derrida is again referring to Heideggerian transcendence, letting beings be, the question of Being, the truth, meaning and sense of Being, the ontological difference as an *economy* of violence, the non-ethical opening of ethics. The necessity of the ontic metaphor, predicative language, a language that says 'this being *is*,' practices the least possible violence in this economy of violence. Everything I've covered so far in Heidegger, however, leads one to posit these questions as another face of the restricted ecology of deconstruction. Why do I say restricted here? If the question of Being is indeed shown to be inextricable from a certain property and propriety of the human, if Dasein's authentic relation towards time, death and the other as such is transcendence as Being-in-the-world, encountering and taking-in-stride the passive resistance of materiality, its letting beings be – if all of these are ultimately human, how does this bode for an ecological ethics?

As different as are Heidegger's and Levinas's thoughts of transcendence, Derrida writes, they both seem to follow the same schema: for Dasein as well as the other. "Who is the

'neighbour' dwelling in the very proximity of transcendence? What is still to come or what remains buried in an almost inaccessible memory is the thinking of a responsibility that does not stop at *this* determination of the neighbour." (PDS 298/283-4) *This* determination being, of course, as human. What Levinas's thought offers Derrida, as it did in his reading of Husserl, is indeed an opening to or a trace of something 'older' than the question of Being, the ontological difference, something that would radically expropriate the propriety of the human, and complicate all limits between the non-living, the vegetal, animal, human, or God.

> The 'logic' of the trace or of différance determines this re-appropriation as ex-appropriation. Re-appropriation necessarily produces the opposite of what it aims for. Ex-appropriation is not what is proper to man. One can recognize its differential figures as soon as there is a relation to self in its most elementary form (but for this very reason there is no such thing as elementary). (PDS 269/283)

Ex-appropriation, he adds, "no longer closes itself; it never totalizes itself... ex-appropriation does not form a boundary, if one understands by this word a closure or a negativity. It implies the irreducibility of the relation to the other." (PDS 270) Such an ex-appropriation, I hope to show, would shatter the circulation of the restricted ecology of the transcendence of the human Dasein and open it onto the transcendence of the Otherwise than Being, beyond the question, language, the name, to the impossible, a passivity anterior to the opposition of activity and passivity, a vulnerability which would expropriate any propriety of Being-towards-death, an ecological Being-in-the-world, a being-on-earth that would not simply let other living beings be as a modification of activity, but a *let be otherwise*, 'otherwise' than letting be, *letting* be otherwise, *letting be* otherwise, letting be *otherwise*, something like what Krell calls *letting death be,* but that I prefer to call *letting live-on,* articulating the ontological transcendence of Dasein with the ethical transcendence Levinas seeks within the trace-stricture of general ecology.

> The trace is always the finite trace of a finite being. So it can itself disappear. An ineradicable trace is not a trace. The trace inscribes itself in its own precariousness, its vulnerability of ashes, its mortality... beyond or before an anthropology and even an ontology or an existential analytic. What I say about the trace and death goes for any 'living thing,' for 'animals' and 'people.' (PM 393-4/159)

§3.2.3: Ent-eignis, Ent-fernung and Ex-Appropriation

The destructions of classical ontology in both Levinas and Heidegger for Derrida operate through a thought of a trace relation to the alterity of a past that has never been present and can never be lived in the form of a presence.[111] This trace, however, itself exceeds Heidegger's discourse for

Derrida. As 'older' than the distinction between Being and beings, the trace or différance "exceeds the question *What is?* and contingently makes it possible," as well as its foundation of the metaphysical opposition between *de facto* and *de jure*, one might even say between the classical and humanist determinations of ontology and ethics Heidegger critiques. (DG 110/75) It is older than the ontological difference because it can no longer be addressed by a question but can only be acquiesced to and affirmed, as I'll show below. As Derrida elaborates,

> Within the decisive concept of the ontic-ontological distinction, *all is not to be thought at one go*; entity and being, ontic and ontological, 'ontico-ontological' are, in an original sense, *derivative* with regard to... différance, an economic concept designating the production of differing/deferring. The ontico-ontological difference and its ground (*Grund*) in the 'transcendence of Dasein' (*Vom Wesen des Grundes*, p. 16) are not absolutely originary. Différance by itself would be more originary. (DG 38/23)

Derrida identifies the necessity of thinking together the trace and the remainder, the 'restance' preoccupying us here: beyond all ontology or any modification of being, the trace *remains*.[112] Older than the ontological distinction and the transcendence of Dasein, the trace constitutes the very ex-propriation of the human, dislocating all propriety, proximity, immediacy and presence in general.[113] Like the remainder, différance and the trace *are* nothing, neither present nor absent, without proper substance or essence; there is no trace *as such*, it rather "threatens the authority of the *as such* in general." (MP 27/25) It is therefore unthinkable as propriation, as *Ereignis*, but is rather a tomb, *oikesis*, "tomb of the proper in which is produced, by *différance*, the *economy of death.*" (MP 4/4) Différance thus fractures both the transcendental and ontological accounts of history. Culture and history are nature in différance: "nature denaturing itself, diverting itself *from itself*, naturally welcoming its outside into its inside." (DG 61/41*t*) All of nature's others appear as the other in différance within the economy of the same: "culture as nature differed – deferred; all the others of *physis – tekhnè, nomos, thesis*, society, freedom, history, spirit, etc. – as differing *physis* or as deferred *physis. Physis in différance*."[114] (MP 18/17) But one must be careful to not simply posit a refurbished concept of ecology as a new name for différance, another opening of the question, proper word or unique name.[115] Rather, "'older' than Being itself, such a différance has no name in our language. But we 'already know' that if it is unnameable, it is not provisionally so, not because our language has not yet found or received this *name,* or because we would have to seek it in another language, outside the finite system of our own." (MP 28/26) It is not by translating other philosophical-ecological systems into our

own that we will adequately think the radical passivity of death, *phusis* in différance and the ex-appropriation of the human, but rather by letting something else appear in the impossibility of such a translation and, in the experience without *Erlebnis* of this impossibility, an-other thought of ecology, a transcendence that is nothing other than and wholly other from what it transcends and the ethical passivity of letting, to name without naming the general ecology of this *oikos*, "the at home in general that welcomes the absolute *arrivant*."[116] (A 68/34) "A 'world' that we no longer inhabit: no more *oikos,* economy, ecology, livable site in which we are 'at home'" might itself be the condition for thinking the promise of the earth. (NII 70) To resist the gathering, the *Versammlung* implied in any *oikos* or ecology, "might be felt as a distress, a sadness, a loss – dislocation, dissemination, the not being at home, etc. – but it is also an opportunity. It is the opportunity of an encounter, of justice, of a relation to absolute alterity." (HF 358)

Let me recall what was said in chapters 1 and 2 on justice and its source in the disjunction and non-self-contemporaneity of the Living Present. It will be a difficult matter of thinking together this dis-junction and ex-propriation of economy with the thought of the gift Derrida develops in *Given Time,* but also the *pas au-delà* and the 'without' of the relation without relation as this interruption. If in a sense for Derrida *Being and Time* is its own '*pas au-delà*,' on the one hand remaining thoroughly enclosed within metaphysics and on the other stepping beyond it, the same can be said of Heidegger after the *Kehre*.[117] As he writes in "Pas,"

> all 'Heideggerian' thought proceeds, in its decisive 'turnings,' by the 'same' de-distancing bringing-near of the near and the far. *Entfernung* de-distances the far it constitutes, brings the far near therefore in holding the far far. The evental propriation [a forced or risky etymology for *Ereignis*] of the far is de-distant from itself... The nearness of the near is not near, therefore is not proper. (P 27/17)

For Derrida, Heidegger's turn to the '*Ereignis*' in *Contributions to Philosophy (Of the Event)* – a term usually rendered as 'event,' but also carrying with it notions of propriation and appropriation, the authentic [*eigentlich*] as well as dis-propriation [*enteignen*], along with the proper [*eigen*] – does not constitute a subordination of the question of Being to the question of the Event.[118] Between the question of Being and the Event,

> the question of the proper-ty (*propre*) of propriate, of propriation (*eigen, eignen, ereigen, Ereignis* especially)... its irruption here does not mark a rupture or a turning point in the order of Heidegger's thought. For already in *Sein und Zeit* the opposition of *Eigentlichkeit* and *Uneigentlichkeit* was organizing the entire existential analytic. Once there has been a certain valuation of the proper-ty (*propre*) and *Eigentlichkeit,* it can never be interrupted. (É 114-116/115-117)

It will be necessary for Derrida to think the propriety of the *Ereignis* with Heidegger's thought of the *Entfernung*, which the former renders as 'é-loignement.' This '*pas d'Entfernung*,' the step without step beyond complicates any opposition or identity between identity and difference, the proximate and distant, the *Fortsein* and *Da-sein* of the world¸ the ecological and an-ecological.

> *Il faut* la distance (qui faut), [*that distance (which is lacking)* is necessary]...distance out-distances itself. The far is furthered. One is forced to appeal here to the Heideggerian use of the word *Entfernung*: at once divergence, distance, and the distantiation of distance, the deferment of the distant, the de-ferment, it is in fact the annihilation (*Ent-*) which constitutes the distant itself, the veiled enigma of proximation." (É 48-50/49-51)

Heidegger ceaselessly complicates the proximity of the proper, Derrida writes, "by showing that the proximity of the near was far, and that *Entfernung*, distance, distancing, was also a de-distancing (*Ent-fernung*) that undid and therefore reduced distance." (BS2 118/74)

For Derrida, the movement of appropriation and de-propriation in the Event and Being cannot be thought apart from the gift. For Heidegger, Dasein is the condition that there is [*es gibt*] Being.[119] "The 'gives' names the essence of Being that is giving, granting its truth. The self-giving into the open, along with the open region itself, is Being itself." (GA *9* 334/255) This dimension of giving for Derrida becomes articulated within the difficult logic of ex-appropriation, and one must think both what is proper to the gift, Being and time and how these give themselves to expropriation and de-propriation.[120] Derrida deploys these aporetics of the gift in relation to nature and the originary productivity of *phusis*-in-différance in *Given Time*. Building on Heidegger's remark that "the gift of presencing is a property of appropriating [*Die Gabe von Anwesen ist Eigentum des Ereignens*]," if différance has no essence, if it "(is) that which not only could never be appropriated in the *as such* of its name or its appearing, but also that which threatens the authority of the *as such* in general," then the same must be said about the gift; there is no gift *itself*. (DT 163n.1/127-8 n.12) The gift must rather be thought as another name of the impossible and its measureless measure [*mesure sans mesure*], I'd say its *in-valuable value*, its value *without* and beyond all economic value.[121] The gift is what overflows and interrupts all economy, calculation, circulation and reappropriation. However, one cannot treat the gift without treating its relation to economy: "the overrunning of the circle by the gift, if there is any, does not lead to a simple, ineffable exteriority that would be transcendent and without relation. It is this exteriority that sets the circle going, it is this exteriority that puts the economy into motion. It is this exteriority that *engages* the circle and makes it turn." (DT 47/30) If we

think the gift in relation to time, we must say that it overflows *and* sets in motion any Living Present, any auto-affective temporalization; the gift is the aneconomy and ex-propriation that makes their restricted circulations and propriations possible. General ecology thinks together this movement of ecological propriation and the radical exteriority of the gift without return, and it thinks *justice* and responsibility in and as this 'time out of joint' beyond all Living Present, all auto-affective temporalization as the promise of the earth.[122]

For Derrida, justice, the promise and the gift must be thought in terms of the incalculable, the an-economic and the irreducibly excessive. They thus require what he calls an anachrony and disjuncture within Being and Time themselves.[123] Derrida lauds Heidegger's attempt to think *dike* or justice outside the Roman concept of law, however cannot accept its reinterpretation in terms of joining, gathering bringing-together, adjoining, harmony, *Fug*, *Versammlung* as the latter does.[124] I don't have the space to devote to a careful reading of these passages with respect to Heidegger's "Anaximander's Saying" here, and only wish to flag a few points with respect to this tension between this gathering and dislocation, dispersion and dissemination. Heidegger's thought of justice comes down to a thought of property and presence, of leaving to the other that which is most proper to them across the proper jointure of presence, and therefore not without economic calculability and a process of rendering justice. While Heidegger sets up the concept of *Versammlung* precisely against any later 'ethico-juridical' representations, he runs the risk for Derrida of reducing justice to a series of calculable juridical norms in privileging propriety, gathering and the same. Again drawing from Levinas and Blanchot, Derrida sees justice in the relation to the other in terms of interruption, disjunction, non-relation and dissociation.[125] However, Derrida clarifies that Heidegger's thought is not simply one of the *Versammlung*.[126] At stake in thinking this concept is

> knowing whether one can think *Versammlung* while including it, integrating and assimilating into it, the play of difference, of dislocation, [this is what I'm calling restricted ecology] or whether it is only to the extent that there is an irreducible risk of dispersion, of singularity, of dissemination, that *Versammlung* can emerge. (HF 356)

General ecology thinks both, the stakes therein being *immeasurable*.[127]

For Derrida, as will prove essential in thinking the '*ich muss dich tragen*' in light of *Die Welt ist fort*, justice consists not so much in a carrying that bridges together the disparate, "but to put ourselves there where the disparate itself *holds together*, without wounding the dis-jointure, the dispersion, or the difference, without effacing the heterogeneity of the other."[128] (SM 58/35)

In other words, as the maintenance of an interruption in relationality that "*maintains* the *dis-jointed* as such; it joins the *dis-* by maintaining the gap... the inter-ruptor maintains together *both* the rupture *and* the relation to the other, which is itself structured as both attraction *and* interruption, interference and difference, a relation without relation." (P2 102-3/99-100) To maintain this interruption beyond economy, calculation, commerce and an ethics that would simply deploy a program, apply a rule and balance values is to recognize "the necessity (*without force*, precisely [*justement*], without necessity, perhaps, and without law) of thinking the gift to the other as gift of that which one does not have and which thus, paradoxically, can only *come back* or belong to the other." (SM 55/32) This disjunction, he adds, necessarily risks the worst evil and expropriation, but no justice is possible without it; it instils an irreducible dimension of incalculability and non-knowing at the heart of any relationality, and indeed of any ecology. Where one cannot respond to the question "who is the 'neighbour' dwelling in the very proximity of transcendence" is where ethics begins.[129] (PDS 298/283)

§3.2.4: Ex-Propriating the Human: Walten and the World of Life Death

For the purposes of general ecology, I'm trying think the ethical stakes of this ex-appropriation as concerns the proper to the human and what we come to differentially share with other living beings in its wake. In the necessity of maintaining the distances, hiatuses, gaps and interruptions within this ecological relationality, to avoid a "dedifferentiating discourse of life" (perhaps suggested by Derrida's frequent reference to 'the living in general'), it is perhaps the stricture of this generality that must be further explicated.[130] Derrida outlines one simple double rule that lends its rhythm to the two *Beast and Sovereign* seminars:

> no more to rely on commonly accredited oppositional limits between what is called nature and culture, nature/law, *physis*/*nomos*, God, man, and animal or concerning what is 'proper to man'... than to muddle everything and rush, by analogism, toward resemblances and identities. Every time one puts an oppositional limit in question, far from concluding that there is identity, we must on the contrary multiply attention to differences, refine the analysis in a restructured field. (BS1 36/15-16)

As he elaborates, it is less a question of returning to the non-human what it was once denied than showing that what is so called 'proper' to man has never really been so.[131] Heidegger's refusal to animals of what he grants to the property of Dasein is well known.[132] Along with refusing the power to access the transcendences I spoke of in Husserl: time, the other, the material world and

death *as such*, the animal lacks the power to speak, access the Being of beings, the ontological difference, the question of Being, Historiality, the call to responsibility, witnessing, truth, the name, *technè*, in short is refused the movement of transcendence that would allow it to let beings be outside of its vital interests: "the animal does not let be as such that which, entirely other, as such, is not in his field of programmed interests;" the animal lacks the authentic mortality that would allow it to transcend its vital design.[133] (BS2 281/199)

All these capacities and powers guaranteeing the sovereignty of the Human Dasein over its others are made possible by the originary violence of *Walten*, Heidegger's translation of the Greek *phusis*, the arche-originary force older than the distinction between nature and culture that is the very ground of the ontological difference and thus everything that separates the human Dasein from its others.[134] It is through the question of *Walten* that Derrida will examine the differential relations to the world between humans and other animals.[135] *Walten*, he writes, must be understood as "dominant, governing power, as self-formed sovereignty, as autonomous, autarcic force, commanding and forming itself, of the totality of beings, beings in their entirety, everything that is." (BS2 72/39) It is inseparable from Dasein's *Trieb* (drive or instinct), indeed from its transcendence as its relation to beings-as-a-whole, the totality of beings, and as being-in-the-world.[136] Dasein's transcendence in the force, movement, tendency and process of this *Trieb* – which is not a drive among others, or a relation between subject and object – is what the animal will be denied.[137] Derrida even closes his seminar by recalling that, for Heidegger, at the end of Greek thought *idea* and *eidos* become the predominant interpretation of *phusis*.[138] The idealism that dominates Western metaphysics, the fascination for form, the *eidos* and the visible object would all be consequences of the violence of *Walten*.[139] For me, this calls for thinking a materiality resisting this violence otherwise, and one that must itself rethink the terms of 'matter' and 'resistance,' one I began to examine in §3.1.2 and will to return to in a moment.

Let's recall that in an attempt to circumvent any biologistic interpretation of Dasein, as well as any biological continuism between it and other animals, Heidegger was led to posit a difference *in kind* between the two, an absolute oppositional limit between all living beings and an originarily mortal Dasein who, even if not a human subject but the basis on which the humanity of the human and the subjectivity of the subject must be thought, nonetheless confirms an infinite, unconditional superiority to the proper of man and leaves intact the anthropologism and humanism Heidegger intends to bypass.[140] It is in the question of death that one finds the true

limit for Heidegger between the mortal Dasein, who has the power to die authentically as its ownmost possibility, to relate to death as such, and all other living beings who, lacking this 'as such,' do not. "The difference between nature and culture, indeed between biological life and culture, and, more precisely, between the animal and the human is the relation *to* death... the relation to the *as such*. The true border would be there." (A 84/43-4) Let us recall here Heidegger's critique of Scheler's philosophical decision to investigate the transcendence of the world in the phenomenon of resistance beginning from elementary forms of life. For Heidegger, it was instead necessary to begin with the entity that we are; he privileges Dasein because as beings concerned with their Being as a question, Being is closest to us.[141] The same methodological choice is reflected in Heidegger's choice of the world to which Dasein relates *as such*.[142] As Derrida explains, the necessity, indeed the order or orders to begin from what is near, to begin any analysis from *here, now*, and to *finish* there,

> this order of orders belongs to the great ontological-juridico-transcendental tradition, and I believe it to be undeniable, impossible to dismantle, and invulnerable... except perhaps in the particular case called death, which is more than a case and whose uniqueness excludes it from the system of possibilities, and specifically from the order that it, in turn, may condition. (A 86-7/45)

Let's also recall here Derrida's discussions of the *philosophical invulnerability* of the Living Present, of Heidegger's deconstruction of the subject as *mortal* against the phenomenological privileging of the living being and its *Erlebnis*. This incontestability is indissociable from the concept of *prevalence itself* in the existential analytic; hierarchy, valorization, evaluation, preference, the proper and the authentic.[143] However, all these questions of order, foundations and transcendental conditions of possibility, capacity, power and potentiality for Derrida "are themselves made possible and necessary by a relation to death, by a 'life-death' that no longer falls under the case of what it makes possible." (A 87/46) If this proper access to death reserved solely for the human Dasein were somehow itself ex-propriated, he writes, the entire existential analytic would find itself compromised. As he concludes the *Beast and Sovereign* seminars, "there is only *one* thing against which all violence-doing, violent action, violent activity, immediately shatters... imposes failure on *Gewalt* and *Walten... 'das ist der Tod'* (C'est la mort)." (BS2 397/290) Death would thus be the element of non-violent material resistance.

To posit a finitude shared by all living beings is not to erase all the limits between them in some homogeneous continuity; *partage* in French also means dividing out; multiplying, creasing,

and folding these lines in attention to differences, heterogeneities, and ruptures.[144] In this question of death, Derrida writes, "*il y va d'un certain pas* [it involves a certain step/not]." (A 23/6) This brings us back to the question of double death I discussed in Blanchot. A certain thought of the possible is at the heart of the existential analytic of death for Derrida, both in the sense that death can happen at any instant and in the sense that it concerns something of which Dasein is capable, has the power and ability for; "death is possibility par excellence." (A 113-4/62-3) But Dasein's most proper possibility, he reminds us, is the possibility of an impossibility, and is thus in a sense its least proper and personal possibility; it is the impossibility of its possibility irreducible to the opposition of possibility and impossibility.[145] The proper, personal death is originarily contaminated by the inauthentic, impersonal modes of finishing common to the living in general; we might therefore correlate a certain *ends of man* with a certain "end of the properly-dying." (A 129/74) If, as Dasein's most proper property, death is also shown to be its most improper and ex-propriating, "and that a certain expropriation of the *Enteignis* will have always inhabited the propriety of the *Eigentlichkeit*," an absolutely indivisible limit between forms of dying across the living in general finds itself compromised. (A 135/77*t*)

Let's recall Derrida's two points concerning these analyses: on the one hand, to avoid dogmatic metaphysical demarcations between the human and its others; in this respect, humans and other living beings incontestably inhabit the same world. On the other hand, it is necessary to not rush into blurring all lines and differences; in the sense, humans and other animals incontestably do not inhabit the same world. But in fact, he adds, not a single singular living being inhabits the same world as another; their singularity is each time the birth and death of the world and any world deemed common will always be the effect of a construction, even a mechanical ruse.[146] And yet, one can at least suggest that humans, animals, plants and so on have being alive in common, along with "the finitude of their life, and therefore, among other features of finitude, their mortality in the place they inhabit" (BS2 33/10) "Whether one calls it the earth (including sky and sea) or else the world as the world of life-death. The common world is the world in which one-lives-one-dies, whether one is a beast or a human sovereign, a world in which both suffer, suffer death, even a thousand deaths." (BS2 365/264) It is in the finitude we share across a world we do not and cannot that we return to Celan's line *die Welt ist fort ich muss dich tragen* as the very beginning of ethics, indeed of the disjunction of the Living Present: there where the world is gone, far or absent I must carry you, and this carrying must occur without any

knowledge, foundation or horizon.[147] The carrying must be understood both as the necessary and impossible desire of a shared Living Present; on the one hand the presumed unity of the world, the 'as-if' of a common world assuring the longest sur-vival for all living beings (but an *als ob,* I showed in my previous chapter, which must be kept at a distance from an Idea in the Kantian sense), and on the other a necessary discourse of multiplicity, untranslatability, the non-gatherable and expropriation; to live as if we shared a world in order to let life on earth live on.[148]

To give the world to the other, let the living live-on, is one not returned here precisely to the non-violent language of Levinas that would depart from the violence of the verb Being and of predication, where "language must give the world to the other?" (ED 219/184) An address, a promise, indeed a response, anterior to any question, otherwise than Being.[149] What Derrida calls a quasi-infinite call to give issues precisely from an originary debt, a *Schuldigsein* Derrida finds traces of in both Heidegger and Levinas, "before owing this or that, before incurring a debt or committing a fraud, I must *respond*... I think you find this in Heidegger, and in Levinas in another way, when he speaks of an originary debt before any determined debt... When I speak of infinite responsibility, it borders on this, it's very close to this." (FSC 72-3) And this is how Derrida thoroughly breaks with the humanism of both; infinite responsibility is "a responsibility *for more than one* [à plus d'un], indeed, before more than one" ... where "every other is every (bit) other [*tout autre est tout autre*]." (FSC 73)

§3.2.5: The Zusage, the Promise and Letting the Earth Be

As I have shown, ethics for Derrida is not a question of 'what can a body do,' but of interrogating a shared passivity, vulnerability, impotence and non-power within mortal finitude as the grounds of compassion among other living beings.[150] And perhaps everything I have been trying to read as the ex-propriation of the proper of the human depends on interrogating this passivity precisely not as a power to question. Heidegger himself would eventually come to complicate and displace the privilege accorded to the question.[151] It is in bringing together the Heideggerean notions of the *Zusage* and *Gelassenheit* that Derrida signals towards what I've mentioned as a post-deconstructive responsibility of the subject, one we could just as well call post-human and which would perhaps itself engage the necessary re-interpretation of the living, the human and responsibility in general.[152] The *Zusage* can be understood as a promise, affirmation, yes,

acquiescence or consent anterior to any question, language and activity.[153] What does Derrida mean by this non-logical, non-chronological anteriority?[154]

> [the address] is *already* there, in advance (*im voraus*) at the moment at which any question can arise about it. In this it exceeds the question. This advance is, before any contract, a sort of promise of originary alliance to which we must have in some sense already acquiesced, already said *yes*, given a pledge [*gage*], whatever may be the negativity or problematicity of the discourse which may follow. (DE 116n1/129n5)

The temporality of the *Zusage* and the promise exceeds the auto-affective and ecstatic temporality of the Dasein; it always already commits one to an engagement contracted in a past that has never been present.[155] Recalling here everything I said about the post-human promise of the earth from "Avances," "the proper of man arrives only in this response or this responsibility. At least it does this when, and only when, man acquiesces, consents, gives himself to the address addressed to him, that is to *his* address, the one which only properly becomes his own in this response." (DE 120n1/135n5) The *Zusage* always comes in the form of a response, but one which must be radically extricated from any humanist, metaphysical or subjective determination of the subject; it makes possible the proper of the human as its very ex-propriation. Indeed, the *Zusage* might not be thought entirely separately from a reaction, one within which every living thing is originarily engaged - prior to any active willing on its part, indeed any autonomy – as its originary promising, the structuring of the living as the radical passivity of its auto-hetero-affection, in an obligation that is neither subjective nor human.[156] The *Zusage* simply says yes to the event, to the other – and lets it come.

The situation for Derrida discloses a dimension of experience as *Gelassenheit*, a receptive or attentive listening that opens onto an-other thought of ethics and responsibility. Against any atomistic individual or self-identical subjectivity, Derrida points towards "a singularity that dislocates or divides itself in gathering itself together to answer to the other, whose call nonetheless precedes its own identification with itself." (PDS 276/261) In hearing the call of the other issuing from an immemorial past, the Zusage promises to prepare a place for the other, to let the other come, and thus leave what is most proper to the other as my own absolute ex-propriation. And death being this radical ex-propriation shared by all living beings, the promise to the other in the stricture of general ecology becomes to let live-on. *One must let the living live-on*, and this 'one must,' Derrida writes,

> the double necessity, the double law of the inevitable and the imperative injunction, *(il faut)*, exceeds the question at the very moment that it reaffirms its necessity," exceeds and makes possible any distinction between ethics and ontology, fait and droit, and points towards an-other thought of transcendence, older still or still to come. (NII 356)

In saying yes to a call from a past that has never been present, one could also say that the Zusage can help us think the ultratranscendental concept of history Derrida seeks in Husserl and Heidegger: "this 'one must' seems then to signal the event of an order or a promise that does not belong to what is commonly called history." (P2 169/166*t*) The 'one must,' I'd say, overflows any determinable epoch of a metaphysics of volition in the history of Being in disclosing a non-willing at its heart, indeed something like a bio-logical reactivity, not towards a non-history, but perhaps towards the evolutionary history of life on earth as nature de-naturing itself, and a promise to allow life to live-on through the compassion in and co-passion of our shared mortality.[157]

It is in this sense that one can understand the *Zusage* as the material resistance that productive comportment lets be beyond its utility or value, in the unbinding of the stricture relating it to restricted economy. What Derrida reads in Heidegger's concept of *Verlässlichkeit*, 'reliability' [*fiabilité*] designates a pre-originary engagement, gift, credit, debt and duty anterior to any social or natural contract, indeed to the opposition of form and matter. "The *Verlässlichkeit* of the product, 'before' its usefulness but as the condition of this usefulness, engages in the belonging to the earth and to the world." (VeP 401/351) This engagement is granted in what Derrida calls "the silent call of the earth... that language without language or correspondence with the earth and the world." (VeP 402/351) It issues from a 'combat' between the earth and the world, inviting us to think the earth, the world and Heidegger's *Geviert* or fourfold otherwise; the play of the earth, sky, divinities and mortals being thought in their "expropriating transpropriation," as he cites it in *Dissemination*, bound together in the ring, (anneau, *Ring*). (LD 430/354*t*) This ring is indeed a wedding band, that of a "precontractual or precontracted marriage with the earth." (VeP 404/354) What is promised in this engagement, I think, is a thought of material res(is)tance that "'lets the earth be the earth'" (VeP 405/354) Between the violence of *Walten,* the economy of ontological violence and the promise, the *Zusage* and *Verlässlichkeit*, general ecology "associates the hidden, crypted secret with the being-in-safety, with what one must hold in reserve or conceal in order to live. Such would be the tightening of this originary ring, such the effect of *Verlässlichkeit*." (VeP 407/356)

If this is thinkable, one might even say that the *Zusage* allows us to name without naming the stricture of general ecology as the bond of a promise given to life on earth prior to any word in any language or discourse. Positioned against the Dasein and its power to name as its opening to the 'as such,' the *Zusage* would not consist in returning a certain experience of language to what was once denied it, but to "think the absence of the name and of the word otherwise, as something other than a privation." (AS 73/48) To think otherwise the passive auto-affective transcendence of time in Husserl's *Vorlesungen* and Heidegger's *Kantbuch*, for which we lack names, beyond the still metaphorical determinations of Being or History, ethics and ontology; the transcendence of a passivity in "a patience [which] is not even ours." (HQ 325/224) To let life live-on, one could conclude, "would be a question of life or death, the question of life-death, before being a question of Being, of essence, or of existence. It would open onto a dimension of irreducible *sur-vival* or *surviving* [survivance] and onto Being and onto some opposition between living and dying." (SM 235-6/185) Anterior to the question, indeed anterior to any ontology, what is promised in the *Zusage* can only be thought within a spectral 'hauntology.' It will then be a question of thinking the revenance of this spectral ontology, this promise-engagement-wedding ring and the temporality of return in the affirmation of this promise, *physis-in-différance* as the difference and repetition of the Eternal Return, in the wedding band between Dionysus and Ariadne contracting double affirmation.[158]

‘But why two? Why two instances of speech to say the same thing?’
– ‘because the one who says it is always the other.’ (Nietzsche)
Maurice Blanchot, *The Infinite Conversation*, v/ix.

Four: Animmanence: Life Death & The Passion and Perpetual Detour of Difference

In his fascinating study *The Implications of Immanence: Towards a New Concept of Life*, Leonard Lawlor recalls that for Heidegger, Nietzsche’s account of the Will to Power constitutes the last version of metaphysics, which Lawlor ultimately sees correspond to Foucault’s notion of biopower.[1] At the very crest of Western metaphysics, Nietzsche’s inversion of Platonism consists in a revaluation of all superior and transcendent values held hitherto, and life itself as Will to Power becomes the principle of this new valuation. Valuation is connected to perspectivism, for Heidegger, which completes the metaphysical determination of *phusis* as *idea*; value is a point of view that fixes the eye towards permanence and presence and, oblivious to the difference between Being and beings, does not let beings be. Heidegger concludes that “thinking in terms of values is radical killing,” and “the value-thinking of the metaphysics of the Will to Power is murderous in the most extreme sense.”[2] Relating this more closely to our ecological optic, Heidegger also argues that valuation and the Will to Power culminate in an absolute and unconditioned domination over the earth: the mastery and objectification of all beings in view of their calculation, technicization and mechanization. Lawlor’s suggestion to counter these disastrous consequences is a renewal of the concept of life, which he proposes as a new vitalism, life-ism or mortalism: a thought of life as powerlessness, an ‘a-perspectivism’ at the heart of perspectivism, a thought of death and radical finitude at the heart of life as the only possible locus of resistance to biopower. So far, this coheres entirely with the thoughts of survivance and life death I’ve been developing here as against what I’ve called the mutual immanence of the ontological and the ethical, the form and norm of life, although I’ve also clearly expressed my reservations concerning vitalism in this respect. As Lawlor argues, however, “the only way to the non-place that defines life-ism lies in the completion of immanence.”[3] Quick to distinguish this thought of immanence from that of phenomenological immanence, that of lived experience to consciousness, Lawlor points to the notion of *becoming* as detailing its more profound sense. As he reads Deleuze and Guattari, the plane of immanence is not immanent to matter or consciousness; to think immanence as immanent *to* something is to reintroduce the transcendent.[4] The plane of immanence has no supplementary dimension and is based on nothing

but itself.[5] And yet, it opens on to the outside even more than transcendence; it is itself the pure and absolute outside for Deleuze and Guattari.

As I've noted, both Derrida and Deleuze draw from Sartre's reworking of Husserl's transcendental field as pre-egological. For Derrida, I showed that the pre-subjective transcendental field constitutes the space where the passive geneses of temporalization and alterity deconstruct the phenomenological immanence of transcendental subjectivity and its humanism from within, structuring phenomenological life as the quasi-transcendental experience of the impossible, what I called its auto-hetero transcendences in materiality, time, death and the other. For Deleuze, however, the pre-subjective transcendental field is itself the plane of immanence, where a flow of non-formed materialities gives itself to organic and inorganic individuations. As Derrida writes, transcendence for Deleuze should have no place in philosophy, while for his part claiming – unless he has misunderstood what Deleuze means by immanence – to resist immanentism.[6] In his eulogy for Deleuze, Derrida writes that his first question to his friend, had he still the chance to ask it, would concern "the word 'immanence,' which [Deleuze] always held to, in order to make him or let him say something that is still for us undoubtedly secret."[7] (CU 238/195)

As Lawlor recognizes, both Deleuze and Derrida are critical of Heidegger's interpretation of Nietzsche. For Derrida, the clearest site of this confrontation is the *Life Death* seminar, where he suggests that in order to rescue Nietzsche's thought from its recuperation by Nazism, Heidegger had to present Nietzsche as proposing a metaphysical rather than biologistic account of life.[8] To inscribe Nietzsche's thought on the crest of metaphysics, Heidegger was forced to gather Nietzsche's account of the Will to Power and the Eternal Return of the Same into a *unity*. For Derrida, Heidegger saves Nietzsche by losing him; by misunderstanding and misrepresenting the nature of the *double* at stake in Nietzsche's work, and by not taking the latter seriously when he writes 'ich kenne beides ich bin beides' [I know both I am both]; I am the living mother and the dead father, the double, the two, *life death*.[9] If deconstruction is always on the side of the affirmation of life, I'll show that this affirmation is immediately and always already doubled. In fact, the earliest discussions of survivance in the essays on Blanchot in *Parages* relate double affirmation and survivance to the question of the Eternal Return. However, the expression 'double affirmation' as far as I can tell is itself first elaborated in Deleuze's *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, which Derrida also cites in "Différance." In "We Other Greeks," however, Derrida

claims that his reading of Nietzsche is very different from Deleuze's due to a passage through Heidegger and the questions posed to the latter's interpretation of Nietzsche.[10] In chapter 1, I'd also explored the roots of deconstruction as an experience of the impossible in Bataille and Blanchot; discussions that, I'll show, themselves take place with respect to the Eternal Return in the latter two, and particularly with respect to immanence in Bataille. Blanchot for his part would greatly influence Deleuze's accounts of death and the Outside, but would himself develop these notions in a closer proximity, if one can use the word, to Levinas's account of transcendence, or at least the relation without relation, the latter notion itself often discussed by Deleuze.[11] Nietzsche, Heidegger, Bataille, Levinas, Derrida, Blanchot and Deleuze intertwine across these nodes in a tangled web, but, as Derrida puts it in *Spurs: Nietzsche's Styles*, "Ariadne is not so far away." (É 42/43*t*) Still, these questions are not as simple as opposing a thought of the living characterized by immanence, vitalism, immediacy, univocity, action, force, power and intensity to one of transcendence, materialism, interruption, equivocity, radical passivity and powerlessness; Derrida explicitly defines survivance as "not simply that which remains, but the most intense life possible." (AVE 55/52) As he adds elsewhere, while a thought of death is inseparable from an affirmation of life, survivance constitutes "the greatest possible intensity of life at every instant," ... the imminence of death itself not being necessarily sad, negative or morbid "but on the contrary life itself, the greatest intensity of life." (SP 48, 52*t*) Deleuze's work is itself incredibly attentive to questions of vulnerability, powerlessness, exteriority and death, and both Deleuze and Derrida place the differential element between forces at the heart of their readings of Nietzsche.

My guiding threads in this chapter will weave themselves around the following questions: in avoiding or at least negotiating the worst; the total domination of the earth by human beings, the unlimited sovereignty of techno-bio-power over all its inhabitants, and given everything I've tried to develop on transcendence, exteriority and powerlessness in the previous three chapters, is immanence really the best way to think a new concept of life characterized by its originary powerlessness and relation to death?[12] I concluded my chapter on Heidegger by suggesting that the *Zusage*, an acquiescence or affirmation anterior to the question, opened onto a thought of life death and survivance that would let beings be, let the earth be the earth, anterior to any distinction between the human and its others. But the 'yes' of this affirmation must be thought of in a certain doubling. How does this doubling come about, and what risks does it entail? Might

one locate in the Eternal Return a thought of the living in its *animmanence*, of the very incompletion and transgression of immanence, and a possibility for an adequate thought of the temporalization of the promise of the Earth, and of life in its radical finitude, passivity and powerlessness?

I don't intend in this chapter to propose a contribution to Nietzsche scholarship. What interests me much more is to tease out how two very ambiguous, often contradictory and indeed barely developed concepts in his work have given themselves to be read in the thinkers through which I'm trying to develop my ideas of general ecology and life death on earth with its others.[13] The fact that I only cite him through these authors itself testifies to the risk of citational doubling underlying double affirmation, as I'll explain below. This chapter will begin in §4.1 with a closer examination of Heidegger's *Nietzsche* lectures, and the role the unity of the Will to Power and the Eternal Return play in the objectification, calculation and technological enframing of the Earth and its organic and inorganic matter. In §4.2, I'll turn to the work of Deleuze.[14] In this chapter and the next, what I've called restricted ecology will understand life in differentials of force and power. But I'll show in Deleuze, as with Foucault in chapter 5, that these restricted ecologies are always exceeded by thoughts of death, the Outside, resistance, powerlessness and impossibility within their very discourses. In §4.2.1, I'll show how Deleuze's readings of Spinoza – with their emphases on the affirmation of action, force, capacity, power, univocity, immanence and becoming against a passivity before death and suffering as external accidents befalling life – are always complicated by his readings of Nietzsche, particularly the ethics and ontology of the Eternal Return as *selective* that yields the question of double affirmation so important to Derrida.[15] I then in §4.2.2 examine Deleuze's plane of immanence as the pre-subjective and pre-egological flow of a single materiality common to organic and inorganic beings and preceding their individuations. But far from proposing a mere differantial between forces and powers, the plane of immanence is itself the Outside, as Deleuze draws from Blanchot; the domain of a resistance anterior to the opposition between activity and passivity, force and counterforce, and thus the site to return life and death against power. I conclude my discussion of Deleuze in §4.2.3 by examining his philosophy of individuation across the Living Present, an immemorial past, and the time out of joint of the Eternal Return and the death drive as itself structured within the Blanchotian notion of double death. The thesis implied in my title is that immanence, at least as it operates in Deleuze's discourse, is as curiously named as the

Will to Power and the Eternal Return of the Same. This is why in §4.3 I propose for the latter two concepts the redefinitions provided by Blanchot in *The Infinite Conversation*: Will to Power as the Passion of Difference, Eternal Return as the Perpetual Detour of Difference.[16] Beginning with a reading of Bataille's general economic reading of Nietzsche in terms of immanence, but also the risk of radical evil, I find in Blanchot a thought of the Eternal Return as precisely that which resists the human domination of the earth. I then in §4.4 turn to Derrida, beginning in §4.4.1 with his reading of Heidegger's *Nietzsche* in the *Life Death* seminar, and show how this comes to structure his own interpretation of double affirmation. In §4.4.2, I show how Derrida's notion of differantial force and power in the Will to Power exposes both to an arche-originary weakness and passivity as the space of the arche-ethical, concluding in §4.4.3 with Derrida's thought of Eternal Return as the only temporalization capable of thinking the promise of the earth announced in "Avances," beyond the death drive (chapter 1), the Living Present (chapter 2) and auto-affective temporalization (chapter 3).

§4.1: Heidegger's Nietzsche *and Planetary Domination*

According to Heidegger himself, his lectures on Nietzsche constitute the most direct site of his confrontation with Nazism, as well as the tracing of a path from the thought of Being in *Being and Time* to that of the clearing of Being in the "Letter on Humanism."[17] While some of Heidegger's commentators have expressed certain hesitations before seeing in these lectures a shift from the 'self-assertion' of his *Rector's Address* to the 'meek prophet of Gelassenheit,' these lectures clearly express an increasing mistrust concerning Nietzsche's philosophy, particularly of the concepts of the Will to Power and the Overman and what Heidegger reads as their dangerous complicity with planetary technology and total dominion over the Earth.[18] Nietzsche, Heidegger explains, understands his philosophy as an inverted Platonism. I've shown that Platonism for Heidegger holds the *idea*, *ontos-on,* the supersensuous as true being while the sensuous is relegated to the state of *me-on*, that which is not and should not be. Overturning Platonism places the supersensuous and ideal at the service of the sensuous and material.[19] Despite the reversal of this metaphysical position, Nietzsche still does not think the *difference* between Being and beings for Heidegger. To understand why Heidegger reads Nietzsche as the last metaphysician of the West, it is necessary to show how and why the latter's thoughts of the Will to Power and of the Eternal Return of the Same must be thought of as a *unity*, as the

metaphysical unity of Being as such and of beings as a whole, thus incapable of positing Being as a question.

In their innermost coherence, Heidegger writes, the Will to Power and the Eternal Return function as the sensuous principle of a revaluation against the transcendent Platonic Ideas. When Nietzsche claims that God is dead, he means the transcendent in general. The principle for a new valuation, therefore, will no longer be a transcendent ideal but the immanent domain of life as Will to Power. As Heidegger explains,

> by *value* Nietzsche understands whatever is a condition for life, that is, for the enhancement of life. Revaluation of all values means – for life, that is, for being as a whole – the positing of a new condition by which life is once again brought to itself, that is to say, impelled beyond itself. For only in this way does life become possible in its true essence. Revaluation is nothing other than what the greatest burden, the thought of eternal return, is to accomplish. (GA *6.1* 375/*2* 156-7)

For Heidegger, the Will to Power is the ontic condition of all beings as such, and the Eternal Return the ontological Being of beings as a whole.[20] In their unity, the Will to Power and the Eternal Return think the unity of Being and beings, that is, in a fundamentally metaphysical way. The Will to Power thus concludes the history of Western metaphysics: when Nietzsche writes that life is Will to Power, he really means that "Being as a whole is will to power." (GA *6.1* 443/*3* 19) As the final word of metaphysics, the essential unity of Will to Power and Eternal Return is also its first, the determination of *phusis* as *idea* and *eidos*.

Heidegger returns to *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology* to flesh this out. The Will to Power names the 'what-being' of beings and Eternal Return the 'that-being' of Being. The distinction between these is sustained by the Platonic distinction between *ontos on* and *me on,* the true and apparent worlds.[21] This privilege of *eidos*, fixing into permanence by way of the look, I showed, perseveres throughout the history of metaphysics for Heidegger. Despite Nietzsche's inversion of metaphysics, the distinction between what-being and that-being remains unthought; Nietzsche cannot address the ontological difference or pose the question of being. Will to Power and Eternal Return

> say the *selfsame* thing. At the end of the history of metaphysics, the thought of eternal recurrence of the same expresses precisely what will to power, as the fundamental trait of the beingness of beings, says at the consummation of modernity. Will to power is self-surpassment into the possibilities of becoming that pertain to a commandeering which now begins to install itself. Such self-surpassing remains in its innermost core a permanentizing of Becoming as such. (GA *6.2* 17/*3* 171)

Nietzsche's inversion thus still engages a determination of being as *hypokeimenon*, *sub-iectum* and permanencing of presence. More than a mere reversal, this inversion transforms the material realm into life as Will to Power. Nietzsche's perspectivism, however, remains bound to a representationalist logic for Heidegger; all perception is determined by the securing of the permanence of a being by way of its outward appearance.[22] Indeed, in this inversion, *idea* becomes determined as *perceptio*, and aim, view, vision and seeing understood in terms of the striving or appetite of life as Will to Power. In the end, Nietzsche's philosophy comes down to a 'morphology,' "the ontology of *on*, whose *morphè* (which too was changed when *eidos* was changed into *perceptio*) appears as the will to power in the *appetitus* of the *perceptio*." (GA *5* 236/176)

Will to Power is then to be thought as this unity of *perceptio* and *appetitus*, representation and striving, and perspectival life the grounds for the new valuation.[23] However, Heidegger distinguishes this definition from any 'striving in general' or 'mere striving,' these being simply rudimentary forms of willing.[24] The Will to Power does not will or strive for power in the sense of willing something external to it. Will wills nothing other than itself as power, which is to say that the Will to Power is self-willing or will-to-will.[25] In reaching out beyond itself, willing is ultimately to have mastery over beings: "will is intrinsically power. And power is willing that is consistent in itself. Will is power, power is will." (GA *6.1* 38/*1* 41) The Will to Power is the original form of affect in organic life; even the smallest organism wants an increase in power. As Nietzsche writes on nourishment, "the protoplasm extends its pseudopodia in search of something that resists it – not from hunger but from will to power. Thereupon it attempts to overcome, appropriate, assimilate what it encounters: what one calls 'nourishment' is merely a derivative phenomenon, an application of the original will to become *stronger*."[26] The Will to Power does not therefore originate out of a lack for Heidegger but is the ground of superabundant life as will to will.[27] As the pervasive and perspectival characteristic of all beings as such, the Will to Power undoes any distinction between the organic and the inorganic. "Even the latter has its perspective... the mechanistic representation of 'inanimate' nature is only a hypothesis... Every point of force per se is perspectival. As a result it becomes clear that 'there is no inorganic world.' Everything 'real' is alive, is 'perspectival' in itself." (GA *6.1* 215/*1* 213) Life is thus another word for Being; "'Being' – we have no idea of it apart from the idea of 'living.' How can anything dead 'be'?"[28]

As I mentioned above, life as Will to Power for Nietzsche becomes the ground for a new valuation following the devaluation of all transcendent values and truths held hitherto. This is why Heidegger interprets the Will to Power as knowledge within this new valuation; "truth is the kind of error without which a certain species of life could not live. The value for *life* is ultimately decisive."[29] The perspectival truth for life is what, from its immanent point of view, secures the conditions of its preservation and enhancement. In being urged beyond itself, the living being constrains itself through the formation of horizons. These limits are not imposed to life from without, but are precisely that from which the vitality of life takes its stride.[30] The horizonal character of perspectives is how life secures beings in their permanence and stability through the morphological viewpoint of a certain seeing. Life looks ahead through the formation of a horizon, and this perspectival securing of stability is "necessary *for* the survival of the living being. The need for schematizing *is in itself* a look for stable things and their ascertainability, that is, their perceptibility." (GA *6.1* 518/*3* 88) Life thus determines its own values from its vantage points in view of its preservation and enhancement. As Heidegger specifies, preservation and enhancement are not two separate things: both cohere in life as the Will to Power as what is overcome and what overcomes, the permanent (enhancing) and impermanent (preservation). In its perspectival-horizonal structure, values are the constructs of domination through which life structures chaos as Will to Power. In this structuring, viewpoints are always given as numbers, measures and values. Values for Nietzsche "are everywhere *reducible* to this numerical and mensural scale of force."[31] "Nietzsche always understands 'force' in the sense of power, that is, as Will to Power. Number is essentially 'perspectival form' Thus it is bound up with the 'seeing' that is proper to the Will to Power, a seeing that in its very essence is reckoning with values."[32] (GA *6.2* 269/*3* 198)

It is essential to note that Heidegger is at pains to differentiate Nietzsche's thought of life as Will to Power and becoming from any biologistic interpretation; life is not meant either biologically in terms of animal and vegetal being, or practically in terms of everyday existence, but *metaphysically*.[33] To think beings as such and as a whole in the unity of the Will to Power and the Eternal Return constitutes for Heidegger a radical humanization of all beings, 'human' being intended here in the metaphysical sense of *animal rationale*. Biology is for Heidegger a regional or ontic science that always operates on a pre-determined metaphysical understanding of life and death. When Nietzsche interprets plant and animal life and the inorganic as perspectival-

horizonal, commanding and poeticizing, he interprets these humanly rather than biologically.[34] The values of preservation and enhancement for life as Will to Power are thus not understood as a 'Darwinian' struggle for existence and self-preservation "but rather as a self-transcending enhancement." (GA *6.1* 439/*3* 15)

The Eternal Return for Heidegger is itself susceptible to this 'humanization' of beings as a whole.[35] What Heidegger calls the collective character of the world involves the entirety of inanimate and animate existence. However, the inanimate and the animate are not in this sense thought as "laminated one on top of the other," but rather "interwoven in one vast nexus of Becoming." (GA *6.1* 304/*2* 84) Here, Heidegger identifies what he sees as two perhaps opposed fragments in Nietzsche to which Derrida will return to in *Life Death*. The first from the notes of the Will to Power, XII number 112, in which Nietzsche writes "Our whole world is the *ashes* of countless *living* creatures: and even if the animate seems so miniscule in comparison to the whole, it is nonetheless the case that *everything* has already been transposed into life – and so it goes." (GA *6.1* 304/*2* 84) The next in *The Gay science*: "let us beware of saying that death is opposed to life. The living is only a form of what is dead, and a very rare form."[36] What Nietzsche seeks in thinking this unity of the living and the dead, the totality of the world as chaos and becoming is to "dehumanize and de-deify being as a whole." (GA *6.1* 315/*2* 94) As Heidegger puts it, however, "viewed as a whole, Nietzsche's meditations on space and time are quite meagre." (GA 6*.1* 310/*2* 90) The temporalization of the Eternal Return remains bound to a metaphysical, vulgar and indeed human characterization of time in relation to the Instant. For Heidegger, any thought concerning beings as a whole must be related to the human thinking beings as a whole, and this is true of the Eternal Return, ultimately a thoroughly humanized temporality.[37]

The Eternal Return is the highest possible affirmation because "it affirms the uttermost 'no,' annihilation and suffering, as proper to beings." (GA *6.1* 249/*2* 30) The ring of Eternal Return thinks living, suffering and circling in a *unity* and in the unity of their returning.[38] This unity is affirmed in the supreme moment of Zarathustra's affirmation, his supreme 'Yes.' Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche's Eternal Return is thus brought into the latter's discussions of nihilism. An absolute 'no' entails the becoming valueless and meaningless of the transcendent in general, along with the highest values of ideas, norms, principles, rules and ends, which comes out of a 'yes' to the new positing and revaluing of values. Nietzsche defines this new positing

itself as nihilism, but his use of term is double; on the one hand, nihilism refers to the classical nihilism completed by the absolute devaluation of all values hitherto, but on the other the unconditionally affirmative countermovement to this devaluation.[39] As is well known, Nietzsche identifies the overman as the being capable of the supreme affirmation of the Eternal Return and the revaluation of all values. As Heidegger puts it, the 'over' in overman is the absolute negation of the human as it has been. This 'no' comes from the yes of the Will to Power in view of a new metaphysical history of humanity. It thus constitutes the human as *animale rationale*; after the abolition of the supersensuous world, all that remains is the sensuous world, animality and the body. Thought (*ratio*) becomes relegated to the service of animality (*animalitas*).[40] The body is not meant to imply a biologism of beings as a whole, rather, "it means that the special domain of the 'vital' is conceived metaphysically as Will to Power.... Will to Power subsumes reason in the sense of representation under itself by taking it into its service as calculative thinking (the positing of values)." (GA *6.2* 300/*3* 224) For Heidegger, Nietzsche's determination of the overman as the meaning of the earth culminates in the humanization of beings as a whole in view of their mastery, calculability for technical utility and objectification. Indeed, Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche posits nothing less than the worst, I think, for all of life and inorganic matter on earth, culminating in the absolute objectification of the world.

> World becomes object. In this insurgent objectification of all beings, that which must previously have been brought into the disposal of representation and production [*Vor- und Her-stellens*] – earth – moves into the centre of human setting and confronting. Earth itself can show itself only as the object of the attack arranged in the willing of man as absolute objectifying. Because it is willed out of the essence of being, nature appears everywhere as the object of technology. (GA *5* 256/191)

What one could call the bio-eco-techno Will to Power for Heidegger struggles to "exploit the earth without limit as the domain of raw materials, and to employ 'human resources' soberly and without illusion in the service of the absolute empowering of the will to power." (GA *5* 256/191) The principles for new valuation become those of utility, calculability and manipulability; the unity of perspective and horizon operate as a 'business transaction' determining the 'rightness' for life, "that is to say, supreme will to power. Only an unconditioned domination over the earth by human beings will ever be right for such 'rightness.' Instituting planetary dominion, however, will itself be but the consequence of an unconditioned *anthropomorphism*."[41] (GA *6.2* 20/*3* 173-4) Domination over the earth is ensured in the positing and calculation of values, "through a total

'mechanization' of things and the breeding of human beings... mechanization makes possible a mastery of beings that are everywhere surveyable, a mastery that concerns – and that means stores – energy." (GA *6.2* 308/*3* 230) While Heidegger argues that the sciences belong to this program of mechanization, he recalls that Nietzsche's thought is metaphysical rather than biologistic, as is his racial thought of breeding.[42] The overman, as that which surpasses man as he has been hitherto, is the only one up to the task of "the modern 'machine economy,' the machine-based reckoning of all activity and planning... only the overman is appropriate to an absolute 'machine economy,' and vice versa: he needs it for the institution of absolute domination over the earth." (GA *6.2* 166/*4* 116-7) Nietzsche's thought thus brings to a close the metaphysics of absolute subjectivity in the absolute objectivation of the earth and the perspectival-horizonal securing and permanentizing of beings as a whole in view to their economic use value and calculability: "all beings become objects. As what is objective, beings are swallowed up into the immanence of subjectivity." (GA *5* 261/195) Value-positing, as that which strives to 'make secure' "has killed beneath itself all beings in themselves, thereby doing away with them as beings for themselves." (GA *5* 262/195) Thinking in terms of values, he concludes, "is to kill radically. It not only strikes down beings as such in their being-in-themselves, but it also puts being entirely aside... killing at the roots." (GA *5* 263/196) In the calculability of beings as such and as a whole, "value does not let being be." (GA *5* 259/193) Having organized everything on earth in view of its disposal for the action of a subject, the history of metaphysics culminates in the ecological domination of the overman over the animate and the inanimate.

§4.2: Deleuze, Double Affirmation, Double Death and the Outside

Despite the fact that Deleuze and Derrida are quite critical of Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche on several of these points, I think one needs to take Heidegger very seriously here. His readings seem to anticipate so much of what is at stake in contemporary debates concerning the earth, its living beings and the animate and inanimate matter of their ecologies. Heidegger's critique outlines potentially devastating consequences of pushing object-oriented philosophy and certain strains of new materialism to their limits at the same time as it guards against the vitalization, immanentization and processualization of beings as a whole one finds in the material phenomenology critiqued by Derrida, in affirmative biopolitics, new vitalism and in certain

interpretations of Deleuze, often through the latter's own readings of Nietzsche, Spinoza and Simondon. Such interpretations, however, often fail to address important nuances in Deleuze's thought on death, powerlessness and the Outside. Deleuze is fully aware of the dangers of a simply inverted Platonism, and his thought of immanence situates the selective element of Eternal Return precisely against this. As he writes,

> Every reaction against Platonism is a restoration of immanence in its full extension. The question is one of knowing if such a reaction abandons all rival projects of selection, or on the contrary establishes, as Nietzsche believed, entirely different methods of selection (eternal return). Perhaps only the philosophies of pure immanence escape the Platonism of the Stoics, of Spinoza and Nietzsche.[43]

I'll begin by reading Deleuze's works on the latter two before developing both in relation to his reflections on life, death and the plane of immanence in sections §4.2.2 and §4.2.3.[44]

§4.2.1: Deleuze's Nietzsche and Spinoza: Double Affirmation and Eternal Return

Against Heidegger's interpretation, Nietzsche absolutely thinks difference for Deleuze.[45] In an interpretation that would prove influential for Derrida, Deleuze understands the Will to Power as the principle of an originary difference between active and reactive forces, as "the differential element of force." (NP 7/7) Against any physical atomism or psychic egoism, force is essentially plural and always related to another force.[46] Nietzsche's world is precisely that of what Deleuze calls impersonal individuations and pre-individual singularities.[47] On this basis, Nietzsche's project consists of the reintroduction of the concepts of value and sense into philosophy, value being understood as evaluation from the basis of 'perspectives of appraisal' and in view of the creation of new values.[48] Against any axiology, value for Nietzsche destroys all known and established values and works towards the creation of the unknown.[49] This creative element of evaluation will prove fundamental to Deleuze's readings of Spinoza, since ethics for the latter comes down to determining what a body can do and what affects it is capable of. What Deleuze understands as affirmation is conceived of precisely along such lines; affirmation and creation "make use of excess in order to invent new forms of life rather than separating life from what it can do." (NP 212/185) Against carrying the burdens of transcendent values, "*to affirm is not to take responsibility for, to take on the burden of what is, but to release, to set free what lives*. To affirm is to unburden, not to load life with the weight of higher values, but *to create* new values which are those of life, which make life light and active." (NP 212/185) As a 'skin disease' of

the earth, the human's constitutive negativity entails the depreciation of the whole of life and the sinking and sickening of the earth.[50] The overman, in the 'yes' of the Will to Power, will affirm the earth in its lightness and weightlessness.[51] "Affirmation is the highest power of the will. But what is affirmed? The earth, life." (N 33/83-4)

For Deleuze, to understand the sense of any phenomenon, whether human, biological or physical is to know the forces composing it.[52] Beyond the scientific calculus of cause and effect, the Platonic doctrine of the two worlds and its reformulations across various idealisms and realisms, Deleuze invokes Nietzsche's perspectivism in evaluating the forces taking hold of a given phenomenon.[53] Every force appropriates, dominates and exploits reality and nature, and every perception is itself an expression of force.[54] In this sense, Nietzsche also reads the will differentially; it does not exercise itself on muscles, nerves or matter but only on another will.[55] As I showed with Heidegger, Nietzsche substitutes the body for the ideal of consciousness as the source of interpretation and evaluation. Spinoza's claim that we do not know what a body can do means for Deleuze that "we do not know... what forces belong to it or what they are preparing for." (NP 44/39) Every force is inseparable from what it is able to do, and any organic or inorganic body is the *living* product of tensions between active, superior, dominating forces and reactive, inferior and dominated ones.[56] This perhaps details what many have read as a panpsychic vitalism in Deleuze, which of course is not too distant from what Heidegger reads in Nietzsche, but I think something else is at stake here. To interpret a body solely by way of reactive forces – that is, by way of the forces organizing consciousness – has led to the false classical dualisms between mechanism and 'finalism' or vitalism; both interpret the organism by way of "securing mechanical means and final ends, by fulfilling the conditions of life and the functions and tasks of conservation, adaptation and utility." (NP 46/40) In both, "we do not know what a body can do, or what activity it is capable of." (NP 47/41) Through Nietzsche and Spinoza, Deleuze gestures towards an ethical interpretation of organic and inorganic life that privileges material affect over form and function. What is true of the biological here is also true of physics in Nietzsche's sense; both go hand with classical nihilism in their need to reduce differences and even out inequalities in "denying life, depreciating existence and promising it a death." (NP 51/45)

As I have shown, the Will to Power for Deleuze is the differential element between forces; it exists both in active, dominating and reactive, dominated forces.[57] When Nietzsche

writes against Darwin that we must defend the strong from the weak, he is attempting to show that "the criteria of the struggle for life, of natural selection, necessarily favour the weak and the sick." (N 26/75-6) In separating the strong from what they can do, the weak and sick contaminate, decompose and entail the degeneration and becoming-reactive of active forces.[58] While reactive forces separate a body from what it can do, Deleuze seeks in the Will to Power the principle of a new affirmation of life, one that works to evaluate and organize its active forces in composing joyfully with others. Here, Deleuze's Nietzsche is very close to his readings of Spinoza. Because force is always in relation, affected by inferior or superior forces, the Will to Power names a capacity to be affected.[59] Long before Nietzsche, Spinoza had seen this capacity as expressing the '*puissance*' of any force.[60] For Nietzsche, however, "Spinoza was not able to elevate himself to the conception of a will to power. He confused power with simple force and conceived of force in a reactive way (cf. *conatus* and conservation)."[61] (NP 70n1/206n18) Still, for both Spinoza and Nietzsche, the power to be affected is not a simple passivity but affectivity itself. This is why Nietzsche reads the Will to Power as the originary form of affect both in the organic and inorganic world.

Deleuze's *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza* lets us develop these reflections in further detail. As Deleuze helpfully summarizes, "all of Spinozism agrees in recognizing in finite beings a power to exist, act, and persevere." (SPE 80/91*t*) Spinoza often speaks of the *conatus* as an effort to persevere in existence, but this effort must be understood as *potentia agendi*, "*a power of existing and acting*." (SPE 78/90) How are the relations of action and passion, activity and passivity, correlated to these discussions of *puissance* and *pouvoir*? All power for Spinoza entails an inseparable capacity to be affected, one that is always fulfilled, either by external, passive affections or its own active affections.[62] A finite body is structured in a differential relation between "two equally actual powers, that of acting, and that of suffering action [*puissance d'agir et puissance de pâtir*]."[63] (SPE 82/93) To ask what a body can do also inquires into the *limits* of its activity. The affections of a finite being are first and foremost passions, since a finite being does not exist by virtue of its own nature, as does God, for example. The ethical question concerning finite beings more precisely asks if and how they can attain active affections. A living being, however, will never be able to suppress all passions, but must minimize them as much as possible.[64] Deleuze turns to Leibniz to flesh this out: the duality of active and passive forces relates directly to life and death for the latter; an active force dies or

lives according to the external obstacles or supports it encounters. Indeed, the morbid effects of passive forces (death) cannot even said to be real; only active force (life) is real, and passive forces the mere finite imperfection and limitations of active force.[65] Spinoza takes this a step further:

> The power of suffering expresses nothing positive. In every passive affection, there is something imaginary which inhibits it from being real. We are passive and impassioned only by virtue of our imperfection, in our imperfection itself... We suffer [*pâtissons*] external things, distinct from ourselves... But our force of suffering is simply the imperfection, the finitude, the limitation of our force of acting itself. Our force of suffering *affirms* nothing, because it *expresses* nothing at all: it 'involves' only our impotence, that is to say, the limitation of our power of action. Our power of suffering is in fact our impotence, our servitude, that is to say, *the lowest degree of our power of acting*. (SPE 204/224)

Deleuze articulates Spinoza and Nietzsche's philosophical position on three points in *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy.* First, the two come together on the question of materialism, the devaluation of consciousness in favour of the body. Second, what is ethically at stake in the question of what a body can do does not relate to any transcendent ideal, moral or value based on notions of Good and Evil, but rather relate to what is good or bad for a living being.[66] "In an ethical vision of the world it is always a matter of capacity and power, and never of anything else. Law is identical to right. True natural laws are norms of power rather than rules of duty." (SPE 247/268) The norms of life constitute the laws of nature, and within these, relations between bodies can either combine or compose together insofar as they agree, or one body can destroy and decompose another's relations insofar as they disagree; Deleuze illustrates this by contrasting nourishment with poison.[67] The norms of life for Spinoza are *immanent* to life itself, and an ethical attention to the immanent modes of life and existence replaces the appeal to transcendent morals.[68] The conatus searches at every instant for what affections can be useful to it, and its power and right to go as far as it can in passion and action are unconditional. Any moral duty is always relative and secondary to the affirmation and exercise of the conatus' power and natural right.[69]

The final point of conversion between Spinoza and Nietzsche in Deleuze's essay champions joy against what he calls 'sad passions,' particularly as concerns the affirmation of life and its relation to death.[70] As he cites Spinoza, "A free man thinks of nothing less than of death, and his wisdom is a meditation on life, not on death." (in SPE 250/271) This man exists so

fully and intensely, Deleuze writes, "that he has gained eternity in his lifetime, so that death, always extensive, always external, is of little significance to him." (SPP 57/41) Long before Nietzsche, Spinoza denounces all the values and 'sad passions' that depreciate life. According to Deleuze, Spinoza proposes a philosophy of life, since he engages "precisely in denouncing all that separates us from life, all these transcendent values that are turned against life... Life is poisoned by the categories of Good and Evil." (SPP 38/26) Burdened with these sad passions, "we do not live, we only lead a semblance of life; we can only think of how to keep from dying, and our whole life is a death worship." (SPP 39/26) What is bad for a living organism seems to only come from the outside as that which exceeds its power to be affected.[71] Deleuze similarly insists on the always irreducibly external or extrinsic character of death in Spinoza. This is what we can learn from the animals; "they do not carry it within, although they necessarily give it to one another: death as an inevitable *bad encounter* in the order of natural existences. But they have not yet invented this internal death, the universal sado-masochism of the slave-tyrant." (SPP 20-1/12-3*t*) The inevitability of death is not an internal condition of a body but due to its structural passive opening to its outside and to what endangers its vitality.[72] Of course, as Deleuze recognizes, "all that we call bad is strictly necessary, and yet comes from the outside: the necessity of the accident. Death is all the more necessary because it always comes from the outside." (SPP 58/41-2*t*) One might well suspect (and this is certainly the thesis of many problematic readings of Deleuze), that the latter ends up proposing a certain axiology, for action, affirmation, life, power, force, interiority, immanence and univocity against passivity, negation, death, powerlessness, incapacity, exteriority, transcendence and equivocity, but the situation is much more complex. Let me attempt to flesh this out through Deleuze's notion of *double affirmation* and its relation to univocity and immanence, and see how this fits in with his readings of the Will to Power and the Eternal Return.

As Deleuze explains, the affirmation of an active force over a reactive one in no way proceeds by way of its dialectical negation but rather by affirming its difference from it. What the will wills is precisely to affirm its difference, to make its difference from the other the object of an affirmation.[73] "Nietzsche's 'yes' is opposed to the dialectical 'no'; affirmation to dialectical negation, difference to dialectical contradiction." (NP 10/9) But what is the nature of this 'opposition' at stake here? For Deleuze, the negative is not the dialectical motor of an active and differential affirmation, but rather results from it. There is no affirmation for Nietzsche that is not

also immediately followed and preceded by a negation; without these, affirmation would be powerless to affirm itself, it would be nothing. As is well known, Dionysus is for Nietzsche the god of affirmation, affirming life in the solar, airy 'yes' in all its lightness and gaiety. In this sense, one could imagine that Zarathustra's donkey, who eternally brays 'yes', I-A, would be the Dionysian animal par excellence, but this is not the case; the donkey does not know how to say no, and its affirmation is separated from the negations that ought precede and follow it.[74] The donkey's affirmation, Deleuze explains, is "affirmation understood as adherence or *acquiescence* to the real, as taking on the real... but this affirmation is an affirmation of consequence, the consequence of eternally negative premises, *the yes of a response*, answering to the spirit of gravity and all its solicitations."[75] (NP 209/182*t*,*e*)

For Deleuze, there is no contradiction in thinking together the Dionysian affirmation that radically expels all negation and Nietzsche's critique of the donkey's affirmation without negation: this is precisely the structure of double affirmation, which Deleuze illustrates by way of the affirmation of becoming; on the one hand, the affirmation of becoming means that there is nothing outside becoming, on the other, it is also necessary to affirm the being of becoming.[76] Affirmation is doubled since it affirms both inseparably;

> for there is no being beyond becoming, no one beyond the multiple... the multiple is the affirmation of the one, becoming is the affirmation of being. The affirmation of becoming is itself being, the affirmation of the multiple is itself the one, multiple affirmation is the way in which the one affirms itself. 'The one is the multiple.' (NP 27/24*t*)

But the being of this becoming, Deleuze argues, is itself a *returning*. "*Returning is the being of that which becomes*... the being that affirms itself in becoming. The eternal return as law of becoming." (NP 28/24*t*) The Eternal Return holds together these affirmations in their multiplicity, in the multiplication of their temporalities, both as the instant and cycle of time.

> On the one hand, a continuation of the process of becoming which is the World; and on the other, repetition, lightning flash, a mystical view on this process or this becoming[.] On the one hand, the continual rebeginning of what has been; and on the other, the instantaneous return to a kind of intense focal point, to a 'zero' moment of the will[.] (ID 169/121)

Perhaps indeed at once both the cyclical reappropriation of restricted ecology, the differential stricture of forces, active and passive affections and the expenditure of an unconditional affirmation without return; the synthesis of Eternal Return thinking together both cyclical temporality (the Living Present, auto-affective temporalization, the death drive) and what

remains infinitely irreducible to this reappropriation, both life surviving itself, surviving death as an external accident and as its ineradicable, impersonal interiority. As both Blanchot and Derrida emphasize, Dionysus is always doubled by Ariadne: "the Dionysian affirmation demands another affirmation which takes it as its object. Dionysian becoming is being, eternity, but only insofar as the corresponding affirmation is itself affirmed: '*Eternal affirmation of being, eternally I am your affirmation*.'" (NP 215/187) The Eternal Return affirms becoming and the being of becoming and requires this second affirmation to bring the two together. "This is why the eternal return is itself a wedding ring... According to the constitution of the eternal return Dionysus is the first affirmation, becoming and being, more precisely the becoming which is only being as the object of a second affirmation, Ariadne is this second affirmation." (NP 215/187-8) This is, as I closed chapter 3, perhaps precisely what I read in the *Zusage* and Heidegger's concept of *Verlässlichkeit*, a promise and an engagement bound in a ring (anneau, *Ring*) that lets the earth be the earth.

The Eternal Return is precisely this synthesis of difference and repetition, being and becoming and double affirmation.[77] It is not the return of the Same, for Deleuze, but rather that of the diverse and the multiple, and is thus paradoxically a repetition that is also selective and liberating.[78] This selection is twofold and expresses Nietzsche's ethics and ontology. Ethically, its selection demands that we will only that of which we will the Eternal Return. Ontologically, its selection operates in that the only being that returns is becoming, the active and affirmative. It is therefore a transmutation and not a repetition of the same.

> The Eternal Return is the instant or the eternity of becoming eliminating whatever offers resistance. It brings out, or better yet, it creates the active, the pure active, and pure affirmation. The overman has no other meaning: it is what the Will to Power and the Eternal Return, Dionysus and Ariadne, produce together. (DF 190/207)

The Eternal Return thus requires a principle for its synthesis that is not that of identity but of difference and repetition, this principle being the Will to Power.[79] As the One which is affirmed of the multiple, I can now approach Deleuze's difficult understandings of univocity and immanence in their relation to double affirmation, Eternal Return and the Will to Power and read these in line with what Deleuze develops as an ethical ethology: an interpretation of organic and inorganic beings not in terms of a transcendent visible or organizing form, but in terms of the materiality of their affections. As Deleuze claims, 'Being is univocal' has been the sole ontological proposition from Parmenides to Heidegger.[80] With Spinoza, however, "univocity

becomes the object of a pure affirmation." (SPE 58/67) The univocity of Being means that Being is said in the same sense for everything that is, infinite or finite, organic or inorganic. Spinoza wishes to assert the value of positivity; the immanence of the expressed in the expression, as against the negative transcendence of negative theology.[81] An immanent cause is one that does not go out of itself and produces its effect in remaining within itself.[82] It is thus in immanence for Deleuze that univocity finds its fullest elaboration in Spinoza, making of univocity the object of a pure affirmation, "which is actually realized in an expressive pantheism or immanence." (SPE 305/333)

When Deleuze writes that immanence implies a pure ontology, that "with immanence all is affirmation," he essentially posits Spinoza's philosophy as a plenum, one quite problematic for questions of exteriority, supplementarity and death.[83] "*No 'nature' lacks anything;* all forms of being are affirmed without limitation, attributed to something absolute, since the absolute is in its nature infinite in all its forms." (SPE 71/82*e*) But he also warns against what he sees as a false alternative between Being as a pure positivity, pure affirmation without differences and being with differences, as difference itself, involving non-being and negation. "We must both say that being is full positivity and pure affirmation, and that there is (non)-being."[84] (DR 345/269) Deleuze closes *Difference and Repetition* in noting that "all that Spinozism needed to do for the univocal to become an object of pure affirmation was... *to realize univocity in the form of repetition in the eternal return*." (DR 388/304) Deleuze thus accounts for both the univocity of being and individuating differences. Being is univocal,

> that of which it is said, however, differs; it is said of difference itself... the beings which are distributed across the space of univocal being, opened up by all the forms. Opening is an essential feature of univocity... Only there does the cry resound: 'Everything is equal!' and 'Everything returns!' However, this *Everything is equal* and this *Everything returns* can be said only at the point at which the extremity of difference is reached. A single and same voice for the whole thousand-voiced multiple, a single and same Ocean for all the drops, a single clamour of Being for all beings. (DR 388-9/304)

§4.2.2: The Plane of Immanence and the Resistance of the Outside

I now want to examine how what I called the auto-hetero-transcendences or exteriorities of materiality, alterity, death and temporalization let themselves be read in Deleuze's plane of immanence. To recall a few of my earlier questions: is immanence really the best way to think the passivity of a letting live-on before and beyond the opposition of activity and passivity? the powerlessness, non-power or un-power before death in suffering? the experience of the

impossible Outside so necessary to break with the total enframing of all living and nonliving matter on Earth in view of its objectification and calculability and the radical killing in the murderous positing of values? Deleuze's readings of the Eternal Return and double affirmation seem to challenge this, but how does the plane of immanence think death, resistance and the Outside in the affirmation of life? Precisely in its doubling, I'll show.

I noted that the ethical question of what a body can do for Deleuze can only be answered by understanding a body as a difference between forces; relational differences of motion and rest, speed and slowness, actions and passions.[85] This entails that each living individual must not be understood in terms of its form or functions but rather "as a complex relation between differential velocities, between deceleration and acceleration of particles. A composition of speeds and slownesses on the plane of immanence." (SPP 162/123) It is also necessary to understand how a body affects and is affected by other bodies. One can never know a living organism in thinking of it as a subject; it can only be defined by the affects of which it is capable and incapable.[86] Here Deleuze draws on Uexküll in explaining Spinoza's ethics as ethology: "ethology is first of all the study of the relations of speed and slowness, of the capacities for affecting and being affected that characterize each thing." (SPP 165/125) Because no one knows what a body, human or animal can do, "it is a long affair of experimentation, requiring a lasting patience, a Spinozist wisdom that implies the construction of a plane of immanence." (SPP 164/125) What does Deleuze mean by this? To recall an earlier point, it suggests an affirmation and creativity that invents new possibilities of life by making use of an excess, rather than separating life from what it can do. These inventions of new possibilities of life, he adds elsewhere, "depend on death too, on our relations to death." (PP 127/92) But what does Deleuze mean by 'excess' here? The question is difficult, particularly because, as he recalls, the plane of immanence contains no *supplementary* dimension. In Spinoza, Uexküll and theories of autopoiesis, I showed, "an animal, a thing, is never separable from its relations with the world. The interior is only a selected exterior, and the exterior, a projected interior." (SPP 165/125) Every living or nonliving thing on the plane of immanence perspectivally selects in the world or Nature what affects or is affected by it. If the plane of immanence is without supplement, ethology must grasp this plan or process or composition in and for itself.[87] Immanence, as Deleuze stresses throughout his work, is only immanent to itself; "there is no longer a form, but only relations of velocity between infinitesimal particles of an unformed matter. There is no

longer a subject, but only individuating affective states of an anonymous force." (SPP 169/128) The plane of immanence for Deleuze is precisely the pre-subjective and pre-egological transcendental field so important to Derrida in defining the zone of passive geneses over and against transcendental subjectivity and intersubjectivity, beyond any determination in advance as animal or vegetal, organic or inorganic.[88]

Le me recall, however, that I wish to avoid Deleuzian readings that present his thought as something of a panpsychic vitalism, a poststructuralist biocentrism. There are then some important difficulties for me when Deleuze writes in a discussion of non-organic life that "everything I've written is vitalistic, at least I hope it is." (PP 196/143) What is Deleuze referring to when, although careful to distinguish his thought of the overman as implying an undifferentiated abyss, he speaks of a "free, anonymous, and nomadic singularity which traverses men as well as plants and animals independently of the matter of their individuation and the forms of their personality." (LS 131/107) Or, for example, when with Guattari he ties together anorganic life, unformed matter and other-than-human becomings, explaining that "not all Life is confined to the organic strata: rather, the organism is that which life sets against itself in order to limit itself, and there is a life all the more intense, all the more powerful for being anorganic." (MPl 628/503) Adding that

> if everything is alive, it is not because everything is organic or organized but, on the contrary, because the organism is a diversion of life. In short, the life in question is inorganic, germinal, and intensive, a powerful life without organs, a Body that is all the more alive for having no organs, everything that passes *between* organisms. (MPl 623/499)

Or when they define vitalism as "that of a force that is but does not act – a pure internal Sension." (QP 214/213) Or, finally, when Deleuze concludes his final essay with a thought of absolute immanence as A LIFE.[89] One can perhaps see the grounds for these neovitalist interpretations of his philosophy here, but it may also be shown that something else, and something more profound and complicated, is at stake.

In *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze explains that individuation precedes the opposition of form and matter. The field of individuation, or 'singularization' as he puts it in "Immanence: A Life," is that of pre-individual individuations and pre-subjective singularities. It is instructive here to paint in broad strokes a debate Deleuze refers in the majority of his monographs between Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire and Cuvier. In both Spinoza books, Deleuze refers to Spinozist univocity

as a forerunner of Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire.[90] Against the Aristotelian definition of living organisms in terms of their forms and functions, Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire understands all living beings as variations and modifications of a single abstract animal.[91] Cuvier in contrast sees irreducible gaps and impassable gulfs between the different forms of life on earth.[92] Against Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire's immanent univocity, Cuvier proposes a transcendent relation of analogy between living beings.[93] Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire concerns himself with the differentials of speeds and slowness of unformed material particles and elements I showed in Spinoza's ethology.[94] This discussion is taken up in Deleuze and Guattari's analyses of the Body without Organs (abbreviated as BwO).[95] The BwO, they write, is a collectivity of humans, animals, plants, inorganic matter and technological objects that does not limit itself to the limits of a self-enclosed organism.[96] The organism is what fixes this immanent flow of matter by way of imposing forms and transcendences onto it.[97] The ethical question of what can a body do, or what kinds of affects is it capable of, involves in a sense ceasing to see the body as a formed, individual organism.[98]

The unformed and non-stratified flow of intensities and singularities composing the BwO is matter itself. It is thus correlated to Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire's position as follows;

> there is no vital matter specific to the organic stratum, matter is the same on all the strata. But the organic stratum does have a specific unity of composition, a single abstract Animal, a single machine embedded in the stratum, and presents everywhere the same molecular materials, the same elements or anatomical components of organs, the same formal connections. (MPl 61/45)

However, Deleuze and Guattari write, this in no way denies any difference between organic forms; Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire simply sees differences of degree between them. The unbridgeable gaps or interruptions posited by Cuvier, they add, only hold insofar as the question is posed as between fixed and pre-established organic forms. Any possible fault, fracture, interruption or untranslatability within these assemblages, Deleuze and Guattari write, would not be "by virtue of their essential irreducibility but rather because there are always elements that do not arrive on time, or arrive after everything is over; thus it is necessary to pass through fog, to cross voids, to have lead times [*avances*] and delays, which are themselves part of the plane of immanence."[99] (MPl 312/255)

But the thought of immanence is not, for all that, without a thought of the Outside, it is in fact for Deleuze and Guattari the absolute Outside itself, "an outside more distant than any

external world because it is an inside deeper than any internal world: it is immanence." (QP 61/59) Deleuze and Guattari cite Blanchot here on "'intimacy as the Outside, the exterior becomes the intrusion that stifles, and the reversal of both into one and the other,'" before referring to Spinoza again in explaining what they call "the non-external outside and the non-interior inside – that which cannot be thought and yet must be thought... the possibility of the impossible." (QP 61-2/59-60) But it is in his work on Foucault that Deleuze develops this thought of the Outside in the most detail, particularly through how the former reads Blanchot on the questions of death and exteriority. Deleuze, however, distinguishes between the Outside and exteriority in Foucault. The Outside is the domain of the differential relations between unformed material forces. The exterior, by contrast, is where these relations are actualized in what Deleuze calls Foucault's 'forms' of knowledge: the visible and the utterable.[100] Deleuze explains that Foucault's thinking is close to Nietzsche in defining power as a relation between forces.[101] But the main question for Foucault is not to ask 'what is power?' but rather to inquire into how power exerts itself. All exertion of power is doubly affective, since every force both affects and is affected by others. The emancipatory dimensions of power (inciting, inducing, producing) are understood here as active affects, whereas to suffer these (being incited, induced, produced) are reactive. However, Deleuze writes, "the latter are not the simple 'repercussion' or 'passive underside' of the former, but are rather the 'irreducible encounter' between the two, especially if we consider that the affected force is not without a capacity for resistance." (F 78/71*t*) Life's spontaneity, its power to affect, is understood here as a function of force, whereas life's receptivity, its being-affected, is the matter of force. Both, as in Deleuze's discussion of Spinoza, are to be understood as a pure, non-formalized function and a pure, unformed matter. But force, he adds, only and always affects or is affected by others from the Outside.[102] The Outside is itself the irreducible condition for any relation between forces, a 'non-place,' 'pure distance,' following Blanchot, "an outside more distant than any external world and even farther than any form of exteriority." (DF 238/253) There is thus, Deleuze writes, a third power *distinct from* the powers to affect or be affected, and this power is *resistance*.[103] Ultimately, "the final word on power is that *resistance comes first...* while resistances necessarily operate in a direct relation with the outside... the thought of the outside is a thought of resistance." (F 95-6/89-90) Again following Blanchot, the relation between activity and passivity opens onto the Outside in the form of a relation without relation.[104] And this relation to the Outside, he continues, also carves

out an inside deeper than any internal world; this is Foucault's figure of the double.[105] Further still, Blanchot's concept of the neutral, the 'one dies,' entails "the conversion of the near and the far along the line of the Outside, as a trial of life and death." (PP 133/97*t*)

One can thus enter the question of unformed materiality with a resistance and an Outside beyond the differantials of force and power, activity and passivity. The beyond of relations of power and force is precisely Blanchot's Outside for Deleuze and Foucault, and this Outside is the alterity of our double.[106] This is precisely what will be at stake in differentiating an affirmative biopolitics from the double affirmation of life in chapter 5. "It's a question of 'doubling' the play of forces, of a self-relation that allows us to resist, to elude power, to turn life or death against power."[107] (PP 134-5/98) Returning to Nietzsche, and closely tying in to our above discussion of the BwO, Deleuze reads in this resistance the liberation of "a life that is larger, more active, and richer in possibilities. The overman has never meant anything but that: it is *in man himself* that we must liberate life, since man himself is a form of imprisonment for man." (F 98/92*t*) Against both forms of biopolitical sovereignty, the sovereign power to make die and let live and the biopower to make live and let die, resistance for Deleuze becomes correlated to a certain vitalism, the capacity of life to resist force.[108] Deleuze here recalls Foucault's admiration for Xavier Bichat who, like Nietzsche, had invented "a new vitalism by defining life as the set of those functions which resist death," before glossing Spinoza and Foucault thusly: while the former claims that we do not know what a body can do, the latter suggests that we do not know what a living being can do "'as a living being,' as the set of forces that resist." (F 98-9/93) But this vitalism, as Deleuze and Foucault put it, is only possible on the grounds of a 'mortalism.'[109]

§4.2.3: The Syntheses of Individuation and Double Death

My concluding discussion on Deleuze will attempt to show how his elaboration of organic and inorganic individuation from the pre-subjective transcendental field allows us to think not only a distinction between what he will call the event and the accident of death, but also the necessity of thinking the two together in double affirmation and the Eternal Return.

Difference and Repetition opens with Deleuze positing a belief in the world of impersonal individuations and pre-individual singularities.[110] The pre-individual is singularity itself, neither active nor passive but neutral and non-personal, "entirely indifferent to the individual and collective, personal and impersonal, particular and general – and to their oppositions." (LS

67/52*t*) For Deleuze, Sartre had been the first to read in Husserl a pre-subjective transcendental field of which the subject is always a constituted effect.[111] As Deleuze and Guattari argue, Husserl had attempted to define immanence as immanent *to* transcendental subjectivity and lived experience. Everything that does not belong to the immanent sphere of lived experience, whether the 'primordial immanent transcendence' of the world of intentional objects, the intersubjective world populated by other egos, or the world of the ideal objects of historical, cultural and scientific transmission becomes refigured as transcendent in Deleuze's reading of Husserl. Transcendence within immanence, then, is seen as a break from immanence.[112] Husserl and his successors would thus discover in the Other "the mole of the transcendent within immanence itself."[113] (QP 50/46) Sartre by contrast, particularly in invoking Spinoza, gives immanence its due in thinking of immanence as immanent to nothing other than itself.[114] Sartre posits a world of *events*,

> that is, possible worlds as concepts, and others as expressions of possible worlds... the event does not relate lived experience to a transcendental subject = Ego, but rather is related to the immanent survey of a field without subject; others do not restore transcendence to another ego, but returns every other ego to the immanence of the field surveyed. (QP 51/48*t*)

To think immanence in terms of a radical empiricism, as Deleuze and Guattari suggest, means to think the subject as a habit or habitus, "nothing but a habit in a field of immanence, the habit of saying I." (QP 51/48) This definition will provide us with the tools with which to read Deleuze's first synthesis of time, the passive synthesis of the Living Present as the habit of contraction, but let's first examine this question of the event in relation to Gilbert Simondon's philosophy of individuation. For Deleuze, along with the critique of hylomorphism (the form/matter binary), Simondon proposes the most thoroughly worked-out philosophy of impersonal and pre-individual singularities. He begins his philosophy of individuation by noting that all individualities are constituted by differences in intensities.[115] The transcendental field of events and singularities is understood as metastable, in terms of the potential disparate and differentiated energies of the event as against the forms of its actualization. Here, Deleuze writes, "an 'objective' problematic field thus appears... individuation emerges like the act of solving such a problem." (DR 317/246) Individuation determines which relations to actualize to resolve the problem of disparate realities.[116] But this passage from the pre-individual to the individual is itself the grounds for a further individuation. Deleuze's three syntheses of time correspond

accordingly; first the pre-individual posing of a problem, second the individuating solution, and third that by which this individuality is fragmented and dispersed and must begin again.

The syntheses of time in *Difference and Repetition* pose a fascinating site for a comparative reading of Deleuze's philosophy of life and death with Derrida's. For both, the presubjective transcendental field is the site of passive geneses; Deleuze begins with what he calls the Living Present, the habit of contraction, as the first passive synthesis, followed by the second synthesis of memory, alternately described as both active and passive, which refer the first synthesis to a past that has never been present, a pure and immemorial past.[117] Finally, the third, active synthesis brings together the death drive and the Eternal Return as the temporalization within which, as both cite Hamlet, "*the time is out of joint.*"

The first synthesis constitutes lived experience within the Living Present. As in Husserl, the Living Present contracts past and future in a series of protentions and retentions, and does not have to go outside of itself to do so.[118] Within this constituting passivity, the syntheses of contraction also refer to an organic synthesis:

> a primary sensibility that *we are*. We are made of contracted water, earth, light and air – not merely prior to the recognition or representation of these, but prior to their being sensed. Every organism, in its receptive and perceptual elements, but also in its viscera, is a sum of contractions, of retentions and expectations. (DR 99/73)

For Deleuze, the first synthesis joins together organic contraction with the passivities of exhaustion, fatigue and need. However, one misunderstands this passive dimension in representing it as the negative counterpart of an activity. Rather, these passivities express *questions* and *problems*. What Deleuze calls the passive Ego is not simply the receptive capacity to exhibit sensations; the organism is constituted by habitual contractions and questioning contemplations prior to its sensations.[119] I've shown Deleuze and Guattari define vitalism as a force which is but does not act; a pure Sensing, and this is because "the contraction that preserves is always in a state of detachment in relation to action or even to movement and presents itself as a pure contemplation without knowledge... even when one is a rat, it is through contemplation that one 'contracts' a habit." (QP 214/213) To contemplate is to *question*, and these questions deploy themselves on the plane of immanence. The Living Present is the site of the problems and questions that structure the urgencies of life.[120] Problems and questions are "living acts... destined to survive the provisional and partial state characteristic of responses and

solutions... Birth and death... are the complex themes of problems before they are the simple terms of an opposition."[121] (DR 141/107)

The second synthesis of time, of memory and of the pure past, is expressed in relation to the first as follows. If habit is the passing of the present, the pure past is another time that allows the present to pass.[122] In other words, the Living Present is the foundation of time while the pure past is its 'ground,' [*fondement*] allowing for a time within which the self-constitution of the Living Present can effectuate itself. Through Bergson, Deleuze calls this a past that has never been present. While the first synthesis in its radical passivity involves a certain powerlessness, where the action is too much, too large for the organism, the second involves measuring up to the action, '*becoming-equal*" and capable of the action. If the first constitutes the posing of a problem, the second may be read to offer a kind of solution.

Deleuze, however, announces the third synthesis of time as its empty form, citing Hamlet; "the Northern prince says 'time is out of joint.'" (DR 119/88) Beyond the incapacity and the becoming-equal to the action posited in the first and second syntheses, the third, the time of the future and the event, return themselves against the self, "and smash it to pieces... what the self has become equal to is the unequal in itself." (DR 121/89-90) Deleuze reads the posing of questions in the Living Present, following Blanchot, as imperatives; imperatives conjoining both ethical necessity on the one hand, and powerlessness and impossibility on the other, as that which both must and cannot be thought.[123] In the third synthesis, this powerlessness is "raised to the highest power." (DR 258/200) To elevate an unpower to the highest form of affirmation is precisely what Nietzsche understands by the Will to Power, Deleuze adds.[124] The third synthesis is also the excessive repetition of the future as the Eternal Return. In the Eternal Return, "the form of time is there only for the revelation of the formless in the eternal return... the ground has been superseded by a groundlessness [*sans-fond*], a universal *ungrounding* [effondrement] which turns upon itself and causes only the yet-to-come [*l'à-venir*] to return." (DR 122-3/91) This pure form of time, which Deleuze also calls *Aiôn*, is less a form than the unformed materiality constituting his thought of univocity, an empty form and a without-ground.[125] Evoking Derrida's discussion of the dead time at work in the Living Present, Deleuze and Guattari write that the pure event of the *Aiôn*, univocal Being, is to be understood as an 'entre-temps,'

> the meanwhile [*l'entre-temps*], the event, is always a dead time, it is there where nothing takes place, an infinite awaiting that is already infinitely past, awaiting and reserve. This dead time does not come after what happens; it coexists with the instant or time of the

> accident, but as the immensity of the empty time in which we see it as still to come and having already happened. (QP 158/158)

But again, this univocity, this pure and empty form of time must not be understood as an undifferentiated abyss, but rather as the return of the impersonal individuations and pre-individual singularities in Blanchot's neural 'One' [*On*].

Deleuze's discussion of the 'On' in relation to death returns us to Blanchot's notion of double, personal and impersonal death I covered in chapter 1. Deleuze also discusses Freud's death drive in relation to the three syntheses of time at length. Against Freud's interpretation of the drive as an instinct in all of life to return to organic matter, which Deleuze interprets as a brute, bare, nude, mechanical, scientific, objective or 'material' repetition, the repetition of the death instinct must be understood in relation to its doubling.[126]

> Death does not appear in the objective model of indifferent inanimate matter to which the living would 'return'; it is present in the living... it is not a material state; on the contrary, having renounced all matter, it corresponds to a pure form – the empty form of time... Death is, rather, the last form of the problematic, the source of problems and questions, the sign of their persistence over and above any response. (DR 148/112)

Personal death is something that happens to me or that I encounter as an external and violent accident. Impersonal death, the death of the 'one dies,' has no relation to me and yet is internal to me; it persists even after I die, and frees the individuating singularities from the form of my Ego, self or individual organism.[127] It is thus, for Deleuze, another thought of Freud's death instinct. As I have shown, both Heidegger and Derrida reject any philosophy of life which views death as a simple external accident. Certain interpretations of Deleuze's Spinozism have nonetheless focused on the 'overrated' nature of death in such analyses. But Deleuze's position is much more subtle; indeed, one might argue that what Deleuze means by immanence is completely elided in such readings. Every death is double: "there is a necessary non-correspondence between death as an empirical event and death as an 'instinct' or transcendental instance. *Freud and Spinoza are both right: one with regard to the instinct, the other with regard to the event*." (DR 333/259*e*) How then, to think these foldings of inside and outside without collapsing the distinction of this double death? One should be careful not to let Deleuze's language in *Difference and Repetition* confuse them; what he will later call the event will always and only concern itself with impersonal death and the Outside. In *The Logic of Sense,* Deleuze distinguishes between the event and its spatio-temporal actualization into a state of things. *Aiôn*, as the time of the event, is

precisely the time of the 'on meurt,' the time of becoming, as opposed to the Living Present, *Chronos*, the time of Being, and the time of empirical and accidental death. Double affirmation affirms *both* in the Eternal Return, the two temporalizations of death are complementary, and the question is thus more complicated than opposing Freud's internal death drive to Spinoza's unhappy accidental, external death. Blanchot's 'personal' death determines the ego just as much in its internal destructive drives as it does in the violent blows it suffers from the outside, "but also the impersonal and infinitive death, which 'distances' the ego, causing it to release the singularities which it contains and raising it to the *death instinct* on the other surface, where 'one' dies, where one never succeeds in, or finishes, dying." (LS 259/222)

For Deleuze, the fact that every event is one of plague, war, wounds and death testifies to the double structure of any event. On the one hand, every event becomes incarnated into a state of things; this is the empirical, accidental side of death I showed developed in Spinoza. On the other hand, there is the impersonal and pre-individual event beyond any present or state of affairs. In the former case, Deleuze explains, my life has become too weak and slips away from me, while in the case of the event, I am too weak for life, and life scatters my individuation back into its singularities. Returning to Blanchot, Deleuze writes, "death and the wound are not simply events among others. Each event is like death, double and impersonal in its double." (LS 178/152) But to think pure immanence as A LIFE and nothing more also seems to mean to think of it as "liberated from the accidents of internal and external life, that is, from the subjectivity and objectivity of what comes to pass." (DF 361/386) To liberate an unformed matter, a life all the more intense in being machinic and anorganic also entails that "a life should not have to be enclosed in the simple moment where individual life confronts universal death." (DF 362/387) The singularities and events of a life coexist with its accidents, he writes, but arrange themselves wholly otherwise.

> A wound is incarnated or actualized in a state of things and in lived experience. A wound itself, however, is a pure virtual on a plane of immanence which leads us to a life. My wound existed before me... not a transcendence of the wound as some higher actuality, but its immanence as a virtuality always within a milieu (a field or a plane). (DF 363/389)

As Deleuze and Guattari write, the field of immanence is neither interior to the ego, nor does it come from an external ego or a non-ego. "Rather, it is like the absolute Outside that knows no Selves because interior and exterior are equally a part of the immanence in which they have fused." (MPl 194/156) The Outside as immanence is both what cannot and yet must be thought,

that which is most interior and most external to thought; it thus testifies to a certain powerlessness, which Deleuze invokes as Blanchot's 'Passion of the Outside,' "a force that tends towards the outside only because the outside itself has become 'intimacy,' 'intrusion.'"[128] (F 127/120) But to think this powerlessness and its imperative can be read precisely as Deleuze's understanding of double affirmation and the Eternal Return in the conclusion of *Difference and Repetition*: "one must live and understand time as out of joint." (DR 381/298*t*) This 'one must' disjoins the Living Present; the necessity for a body to think and to live what is impossible for it: the inside condenses a past by confronting it to a future that can only come from the outside, which enjoins one to "think the past against the present and resist the latter, not in favour of a return, but 'in favour, I hope, of a time to come' (Nietzsche)." (F 127/119) To think this, Deleuze and Guattari suggest, is nothing less than "the creation of a new earth to come," "thinking consists in stretching out a plane of immanence that absorbs the earth (or rather, 'adsorbs' it)." (QP 89/88)

§4.3: Animmanence in Bataille and Blanchot

As I mentioned in the introduction, my hunch is that immanence, at least as it operates in Deleuze's discourse, is as curiously named as the Will to Power and the Eternal Return of the Same if one takes seriously what he writes on double affirmation, resistance, the Outside and double death. But given that Bataille also radically rereads the Will to Power and the Eternal Return in terms of immanence, I think we have to take into account Derrida's understanding of general economic concepts with respect to their sliding into non-sense (particularly the classical concepts of experience, interiority, sovereignty and materiality).[129] This is what is at stake for me in thinking *animmanence*, which doesn't really do anything but resist the completion of immanence, asking something else of it. Blanchot likewise reads the Will to Power as the *Passion of Difference* and the Eternal Return of the Same as the *Perpetual Detour of Difference*, deploying precisely the passivity necessary to think the affirmation of life on earth in its powerlessness, beyond the differantials of force that would enframe all its living and nonliving matter in view of its calculability and use-value. If, as I'll show in my section on Derrida, Heidegger attempts to rescue Nietzsche from a biological theory of life culminating in Nazism only to enclose him in a metaphysics of life culminating in the technological and objectification of everything on earth, one senses a risk of the worst, of radical evil in any interpretation of

Nietzsche. This is not, for Bataille and Blanchot, accidental; when Bataille reads Nietzsche as a philosopher of evil, one must understand this in the context of the sovereign affirmation that breaks with all calculability to open itself onto the impossible; an impossible that can be anything whatsoever, the worst or the best. (For Bataille, National Socialism was itself a war of transcendence against immanence.)[130] Blanchot reads the Eternal Return as the disaster itself.[131] But this disaster and evil are themselves, as impossibly difficult to think as this is, the condition of the gift, the promise and affirmation in the first place, an unconditional affirmation paradoxically bound to selection, inheritance and filtration in its reaffirmation.

Let me begin with Bataille's reading of Nietzsche and its implications of immanence. A general economy of energy, Bataille recalls, relates objects of thought to an unusable expenditure of energy that is not transcendent but immanent.[132] The very definition of energy for him is the destruction of limits, the *immanence* of the impossibility of accepting a limit, and thus its overflowing.[133] In chapter 1, I proposed Bataille and Blanchot's shared thought of experience as an authority that expiates itself precisely as a Nietzschean transvaluation. As the experience of the impossible, sovereign affirmation is to be thought beyond all activity, project, knowledge or truth, all of which belong to the domain of transcendence for Bataille. Transcendence here refers both to transcendent objects and the transcendence of God, both implicating one another.[134] The world of transcendent, known objects weaves a network of exteriority through me, within which my activity annihilates me. I survive this, however, by weaving relations of indefinite immanence that tear through the transcendent domain of activity and objects as its 'sumptuous doubles,' beyond all hierarchy, valuation and production.[135] Immanence refers one to a non-object, an aneconomic end and value in itself that is precisely unproductive expenditure. Sovereignty is the self-destruction of transcendence, and it also corresponds to powerlessness for Bataille.[136] While dialectics thinks the coincidence of immanence and transcendence by thinking the latter as an accomplishment and possibility, immanence becomes neutralized in the language of the possible. For dialectical phenomenology, "the key point slips away (the marriage, however secret, of life and death). Nietzsche *alone* places himself on the side of glory and laughter." (OC5 542*t*) How does the sovereign affirmation of Nietzsche's laughter relate to his concepts of Will to Power and Eternal Return? this marriage of life and death?

In *On Nietzsche*, Bataille specifically positions himself against any practical or political interpretation of the Will to Power, the overman and the Eternal Return.[137] Insofar as the Will

relates to activity and certainty, it belongs to transcendence. The Will only risks something it can calculate, of which it is certain and capable. Death, on the other hand, is the contrary of certainty, and the Will therefore a negation of death.[138] The Will is suspended over the infinite opening and abyss of time, but neutralizes its nothingness through action, neutralizes life itself. And while the horror and risk of death are certainly painful, these are the condition of any chance or future. Nietzsche loves this non-knowledge of the future, Bataille explains, and does not posit the simple acceptance of suffering and the tragic, which would come down to a transcendent imperative, rather, he implores us to love suffering, the worst, a demand proceeding from the passive presence of the abyss within Nietzsche himself.[139] Nietzsche is less the philosopher of the Will to Power for Bataille than the philosopher of 'evil' [*mal*]. "For him the attraction and *value* of evil... gave significance to what he intended when he spoke of power." (OC6 16/n xxii) The Will to Power is precisely 'the love of evil' for Bataille, beyond any utility or calculability of its stakes, in a sense "the will to evil, amounting to the will to *expenditure* or risk (which Nietzsche stressed)." (OC6 169/n 144) The sovereign affirmation of an expenditure without return not only opens onto the worst, but the impossible itself; "the Will to Power is at bottom the will to the impossible." (OC6 480*t*)

As this opening to the impossible, one thus understands for Bataille what makes Nietzsche both laugh and cry in thinking the Eternal Return, since it bares the impossible and unknowable depth of everything.[140] Bataille thus insists on inverting its usual sense:

> *It's not the promise of infinite repetitions that lacerates but this: that the instants caught up in the immanence of return suddenly appear as ends. One must not forget that* in every system *these instants are seen and designated as means: every moral system says 'may each instant of your life be* motivated*.' Return* unmotivates *the instant and frees life of ends, and thereby ruins it in advance.* (OC6 23/n xxix*t*)

The Eternal Return is a time that questions life itself, exposing whatever sense life may have to its sliding into non-sense.[141] This is what Bataille calls Nietzsche's *inner experience*; the sliding towards the impossibility of time that is the Eternal Return.[142] The Eternal Return lays the conditions through which life accesses the impossible, but the impossible can only be accessed by way of the possible. Possibility is the leap, the Overman and the Will to Power and it is within these that the impossibilities of inner experience, Eternal Return and Zarathustra's laughter reveal themselves.[143] Immanence is in this sense Eternal Return, a time beyond time, an instant removed from the time of the project and action.[144] States of immanence are beyond good and

evil; tragedy and comedy coincide within them and open onto every risk and chance in the experience of the impossible. "Upon reaching immanence, our life has finally left the stage of the masters behind." (OC6 170/n 146)

It seems that everything Bataille writes about powerlessness, sovereignty and impossibility as immanence is refigured as transcendence in Blanchot, who is unsure that Nietzsche's negation of transcendence must result in a dogmatic affirmation of immanence.[145] Blanchot identifies two forms of speech in Nietzsche: one belongs to philosophical discourse, the other is the '*parole de fragment*,' fragmentary speech. These correspond to two pluralisms in Nietzsche; one of philosophical ambiguity and another beyond the opposition of plurality or unity that affirms difference and the Outside.[146] It is necessary that the human and the world become a philosophical totality so that, in the perishing of the human and its liberation from the values of its philosophical knowledge (the categories of transcendence/immanence, world/non-world, God/man), the Outside can be affirmed. The reason Nietzsche's affirmation thus cannot do without the negation of God is because

> *transcendence haunts him*, as what he must endlessly surmount to be free. Freedom is to God what Ariadne is to Theseus and Dionysus: first, it annihilates him, as Ariadne annihilates Theseus: 'That is the sign of my supreme love, to reduce him to nothing.' But then, Ariadne needs Dionysus, the god torn apart, who tells her 'I am your labyrinth.' (BPF 287/296-7*t, e*)

A spectral transcendence welds the wedding ring of double affirmation, and this transcendence is what I showed Deleuze call the passion of the Outside. It designates for Blanchot a Levinasian ethical relation to the other that absolutely limits my power and mastery and turns it into an impossibility.[147] Impossibility is itself the passion of the Outside; it is the ethical resistance posed by the powerlessness before suffering and death I share with all living beings. As I showed in chapter 1, Blanchot wishes to distinguish a thought of death from that bound to power and possibility: an impersonal death before which I am powerless, a death impossible to die, which is not an external accident but comes from a time without present to which I have no relation.[148]

Blanchot comes close to the *Zusage* in his thought of affirmation, 'parole' and the 'panic question,' opening *The Infinite Conversation* by defining its single law as an originary acquiescence posed against the question of Being and its gathering.[149] This accord is beyond Being and anterior to the ontological difference, referring thought to an invisibility anterior to the opposition of visibility and invisibility, anterior to the determination Being as *idea*, I'd add.[150] If

Nietzschean transvaluation for Heidegger simply exchanged *idea* for *perceptio*, the latter's thought itself remains in this metaphysical privilege of sight for Blanchot, thus within the discourse of power and possibility. Blanchot's affirmation, however, exceeds the power to question, denotes the impossibility of questioning.[151]

This thought of an impossible affirmation comes to designate the Eternal Return precisely as an impossibility and un-power over and against perspectivism, valuation and what I've called technobiopolitical enframing. The return of time escapes the order of possibility, and its impossibility "signifies the defeat of the overman as will to power... eternal return is not of the order of power. The experience of the Eternal Return ruins all perspectives." (BEI 224/149*t*) Transvaluation thus in no way substitutes perspectival valuation to ideal, transcendent value but brings one to an order beyond the notion of valuation itself.[152] Against the technoscientific project of planetary dominion, human mastery and its insatiable preservation-enhancement in and as the Will to Power, transvaluation strikes classical nihilism with a weakness and a powerlessness that "lays waste in one stroke to our attempts to dominate the earth and to free ourselves from nature by giving it a meaning, that is, by denaturing it." (BEI 225/149) At stake here is nothing less than the affirmation of Return, "the affirmation that, in passing from the No to the Yes, refutes nihilism, but does nothing other than affirm it, and henceforth extends it to every possible affirmation." (BEI 225/150) This affirmation without power belongs to the time without presence of suffering and death, and thus affirms only by excess and in its impossibility.[153] Impossible death exceeds our force, power and activity, and while affirmation certainly on the one hand affirms the immanence of death in life, on the other

> this immanence is not given; it is to be achieved. It is our task, and such a task consists not only in humanizing or in mastering the foreignness of our death by a patient act, but in respecting its 'transcendence.' We must understand in it the absolutely foreign, obey what exceeds us, and be faithful to what excludes us. (BEL 130/127)

Affirmation for Blanchot comes from an absence of time, a time without present, which he follows Levinas in calling time as patience; "it is the time when nothing begins, when initiative is not possible, when, before the affirmation, there is already the return of the affirmation." (BEL 20/29) Affirmation does not issue from a past that would be a modification of presence but from the always already past time of Return, ruining in advance any authority, consistency or knowability. It must be understood as an originary and perpetual detour and neutrality; it cannot be grasped in a traditional thought of affirmation any more that it can be refused in negation, it

cannot be questioned or offered as a response. Blanchot writes of the Eternal Return as "the detour of all thought." (BEI 222/148) This is perhaps why, he suggests, Zarathustra announces the overman "enthusiastically and with categorical clarity," while "anxiously, hesitatingly, fearfully, he announces the thought of eternal return." (BEI 222/148) But this detour must be thought as *immediacy*; a non-dialectical, non-phenomenological and non-ontological immediacy to be sure, resisting both transcendence and immanence as metaphysical concepts. For Blanchot, the immediate corresponds to what I've shown Derrida, Levinas and Deleuze call a relation without relation, a relation beyond mediation and immediacy excluding all fusion, visible or sensible contact and finally its own immediacy. It relates for Blanchot to an impossible relation beyond power.[154]

If the Eternal Return is to be thought as powerlessness, despite the fact that it is where everything that can be affirmed affirms itself eternally, it is because it repeats itself as the thought of fragmentation; the doubling of speech that always comes from the other, as I cited in epigraph. "The eternal return says time as an eternal repetition, and fragment speech repeats this repetition by stripping it of any eternity... withdraws it from everything that has the power of repeating." (BEI 238/159) As concerns temporality, the affirmation of the future is itself doubled in the Eternal Return. On the one hand, the future presents itself as a temporal instance, open to repetition within the ring of Return. On the other, Blanchot writes, "there is the *future* itself of 'Everything Returns' – the to-come [*l'à-venir*] now carried to the greatest power of lack." (BEI 417/280) This 'Everything Returns' in the affirmation of return is beyond Being and the temporality of time; it is the Outside itself.[155] This is why the affirmation of Return, in the very attempt to make of the instant of its affirmation that within which time turns, ruptures entirely with the sovereignty of its affirmation, carried away in the detour of its own exteriority. "There is no moment – no instance – for the affirmation of all affirmation, any more than for he who would affirm it since its presence means: a lack whose lack no mark could indicate without thereby annulling itself." (BEI 418/280-1) Eternal Return is also what Blanchot calls the disaster, a suffering in thought, as he follows Nietzsche, a non-human passivity, an impure loss, excess and torment, but also a gift of time without contemporaneity, synchronicity or community. Following Derrida and Heidegger, the Eternal Return that is the disaster gives both life and death in the passivity of an ex-appropriation. In Bataille, this gift is that of an expenditure, transgression and impossible loss in a general economy beyond utility. In Levinas, the

transcendence of the other obligates towards a giving as *disinterest* (transcendence and disinterest for Levinas being precisely the contrary of the *conatus* and immanence).[156] Disaster gives the time of survival itself. While Nietzsche targets personal and religious immortality and the desire for eternal life, '*as if my survival were something necessary*,' Blanchot remains suspicious of a corrective that would desire life in the ephemerality of the instant.[157] Rather, the life that the disaster of Return gives is without any sur-vival, temporal necessity, presence or duration:

> This is what best exposes time: pure difference, the *lapse* of time, the unbridgeable interval which, crossed, becomes limitless by virtue of the impossibility of any crossing (it is impossible to cross, inasmuch as it is already crossed). The transcendence that living is, and that cannot be satisfactorily expressed as sur-vival (a surpassing of life), is rather the pressing demand of an *other* life, the life of the other. From this life everything comes, and turned to it, we cannot turn back. 'as if survival [sur-vival] were necessary to life.' (BED 163/105)

If survivance is the most intense life possible for Derrida, the exteriority of Return also exposes it to an infinite process of 'disintensification.'[158] When Blanchot writes of the Eternal Return in terms of the affirmation of difference and repetition, he also cites Derrida and Deleuze in his discussion of force and the Will to Power.[159] For the latter two, force cannot be thought in the singular; only in a differential relation to other forces. Blanchot here recalls Derrida's point in "Force and Signification" that the beginning of Greek philosophy constituted a shift from force to *eidos*, a visible form for the metaphysical eye.[160] Metaphysics will have always attempted to separate force from its sense by enclosing it within the play of light and darkness. For Derrida, however, both force *and weakness* cannot be understood in terms of clarity or obscurity. As the differential element between forces, Blanchot concludes, nor can the Will to Power; it does not impose itself as the power of a dominating violence; force itself in its exteriority is beyond the opposition of light and dark, indeed any optical reference point.[161] The Will to Power, he concludes, is "the passion of difference." (BEI 241/161) A *pathos*, as he follows Nietzsche, an affect and passivity that ruins in advance all perspectivism, every point of view, the visibility of every form, the fascination for form and organic contour, and thus situates us in the neutral passivity within which to let life live-on. As evaluation, the Passion of Difference does not constitute the world as an object of interpretation; in its originary doubling and multiplicity, it yields a thought of the earth *and* and *as* its outside, what I'm calling animmanence here. "The world is its very outside: the affirmation that *exceeds* every power to affirm and, in the

endlessness of discontinuity, is the play of its perpetual *redoubling* – will to power, eternal return." (BEI 245/164)

The Will to Power, to anticipate the discussion of Derrida, might be thought precisely as the transgression, transcendence of the *pas au-delà*.[162] Transgression, Blanchot writes, "is not a simple letting go, not that it decides, and, there where it had no hold on anything, by chance and sovereignly, would go beyond the power to do anything even to the impossible. Transgression transgresses by passion, patience and passivity." (BPA 162/119) As the passion of difference, one can read the Will to Power as that which transgresses immanence towards a beyond it immediately nullifies, leaves incomplete, and this holds just as well for life's relation to death as life death and sur-vivance, in its passivity and powerlessness. "Transgression: the inevitable accomplishment of what is *impossible* to accomplish – and this would be dying itself." (BPA 147/107) What transgression transgresses is the law that states that death is impossible to die in the present; it thus breaks with the time of the present and opens onto the time of un-accomplishment, "the time of difference in which this would always take place because it has always already happened: dying, returning [*revenir*]... 'Thus a time without present would be affirmed, according to the demand of the return.' – 'This is why even transgression does not accomplish itself." (BPA 147/107-8*t*) To think the Passion of Difference and the Perpetual Detour of Difference in their perpetual redoubling, then, incompletes immanence. Even if Eternal Return seems to propose time as an accomplished circulation, "inasmuch as it breaks the ring in its middle, it proposes a time not uncompleted, but, on the contrary, finite, except in the present point that alone we think we hold, and that, lacking, introduces rupture into infinity, making us live as in a state of perpetual death." (BPA 22/12) Only Nietzsche, Blanchot writes, was able to think both the accomplishment of time as the present and the absolute destruction of the present in the Eternal Return, and to carry this incompleteness to its impossible, infinite affirmation. "The 're' of the return inscribes like the 'ex,' opening of every exteriority: as if the return, far from putting an end to it, marked the exile, the beginning in its rebeginning of the exodus. To return [*revenir*] would be to ex-center oneself anew, to wander. Only the *nomadic* affirmation *remains*." (BPA 49/33) Allow me to now pursue these reflections on double affirmation in my respective renaming of the Will to Power and Eternal Return as *the transgression to powerlessness* and *the infinitely finite revenance of différance* in Derrida's work on Heidegger and Nietzsche.

§4.4: Derrida, the Double, the Transgression to Powerlessness, the Infinitely Finite Revenance of Différance

§4.4.1: Doubling Heidegger's Nietzsche

In his seminar *La Vie la mort*, Derrida explains that Heidegger, in his own lectures devoted to Nietzsche, had attempted to rescue the latter's thought from its appropriation by Nazism by insisting that Nietzsche, far from proposing a biologistic theory of life, was in fact developing the concept of life metaphysically. As I've shown, Heidegger situates Nietzsche's thought on the crest of metaphysics as its accomplishment in the Will to Power. Whether discussing the concept of chaos in the Eternal Return, Nietzsche's alleged biologism or the Will to Power as knowledge, Heidegger's readings always operate in the interest of gathering Nietzsche's thought into a unity and an accomplished system for Derrida.[163] In this sense, the latter writes, Heidegger's move always implies a certain decision concerning the values of gathering and unicity, one which Derrida recalls ought to be entered into relation with everything Heidegger says about authenticity and thus of course with everything I covered concerning the ex-appropriation of authentic temporalization, death as one's ownmost propriation and so on.[164] What I read in terms of the *Ent-fernung* in my previous chapter will find itself engaged in Derrida's "Pas" on Blanchot, the non-negative *pas au-delà* as the key to thinking double affirmation in Derrida's sense. I explained above that Heidegger sees the Eternal Return and the Will to Power as forming a single thought, saying a single thing; in naming beings as such and as a whole, this unity effaces the ontological difference and the thought of Being as a question. As Derrida puts it in *Spurs*, however, a certain dehiscence operates in Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche every time the question of Being is related to this value of propriation, the valorization of valorization itself, the preference for preference that orders the entire existential analytic of death in *Being and Time*. As I showed in chapter 3, Derrida agrees in *Aporias* that this ordering is irrecusable, except perhaps in the case of death, since the latter is beyond the system of possibility and order. Questions concerning death as a possibility are themselves made possible by *life death*.[165]

In deciding on this value of unity, Heidegger relegates Nietzsche's statements 'ich kenne beides, ich bin beides' (I know both, I am both) and 'I am living I am dead' to something inessential before the essential unity and unicity of the latter's philosophy.[166] For Derrida, Heidegger wishes to save the unity of Nietzsche's thought and name against the equivocity, duplicity and ambiguity of his life and work. In *The Ear of the Other*, however, he suggests that

Nietzsche's name itself says the double; insofar as he is his father, he is dead, and as his mother, he is living, surviving; the two, he adds in the seminar, is life death.[167] In "Ulysses gramophone," the structure of double affirmation is precisely what marks the impossibility of gathering Nietzsche's philosophy into the signature of his proper name. The two yeses "sign yet prevent the signature from gathering itself together. They can only call up another *yes*, another signature." (UG 143/308) When Nietzsche writes that one can only understand the *Zarathustra* if one has a foot beyond life, one must understand this in the syntax of Blanchot's *pas au-delà*.[168] The non-dialectical *step/not beyond*, this *pas de sur-vie* is more important than the question of life and/or death, the difference between the autobiographical and autothanatographical, even the biopolitical and thanatopolitical. Both names are bound within the ring of the Eternal Return and double affirmation, which can never be understood in the time of the present, but as "a certain affirmative re-petition (yes, yes) of a certain re-turn, restarting and reproducing, in a certain manner, the affirmation of the Eternal Return, and guarding it as the eternal return of the same." (L2, 13*t*) Beyond the economy of the proper, "the contradiction of the 'double' goes beyond the tearing negativity that could be contained in a dialectical opposition. What counts in the final accounting is beyond the account, it is a certain *pas au-delà*." (OA 32/19*t*)

As Derrida explains, both of Heidegger's targets in the interpretation of Nietzsche concern life; on the one hand, those who read him as a philosopher of life (let's recall Heidegger's polemic against *Lebensphilosophie* in chapter 3), and on the other Nietzsche's alleged biologism. In contrast to Heidegger's preference for gathering Nietzsche's thought into a totality, Derrida recalls the fragment I showed Heidegger cite from the notes to *The Will to Power*, wherein the world was said to be the ashes of countless living beings, 'and even if the animate seems so miniscule in comparison to the whole,' everything has already been converted into life. The translation Derrida proposes says "si peu de choses soit le vivant par rapport à la totalité."[169] (L9, 1*t*) For him, this fragment alone is sufficient to discredit Heidegger's reading; Nietzsche's thought is not a thought of totality;

> if the living being is smaller than a whole that has nonetheless wholly been and will wholly be converted into life, if the living being is thus more and less than the whole that it is, and if this must be said in the same stroke of the dead, is it not the case that this thought of life death does not submit itself in any case to a univocal sense of totality, to a univocal sense of the relation whole/non-whole, and that consequently the thought of the eternal return that, of course, runs through this statement is not *a thought of totality*?[170] (L9, 1*t*)

If Nietzsche's thought thus implies something other than the metaphysical totality of beings as such and as a whole, is Nietzsche something other than a thinker of beings and of the question? Life and death would no longer be determinations of beings if life death is originary; "the value of totality finds itself deprived of any authority, as soon as the whole is, according to the eternal return, more and less than itself. What of life death if they no longer belong to a thought of totality?"[171] (L9, 2-3*t*) When Heidegger then engages the second aphorism from *The Gay Science* concerning life as a rare kind of death as in *contradiction* with the previous fragment, Derrida wonders what might happen if the dialectical logics of contradiction, opposition, and so on, no longer hold exclusively, particularly with respect to life and death; the very contradiction between the two fragments would be an effect of *life death*.[172]

In a sense, Derrida suggests, the difference between Being and beings is perhaps suspected by Nietzsche in a nonmetaphysical sense. Heidegger understands both a biologism and a metaphysics of life to come down to one another; biology does not understand that it has always already taken a metaphysical decision concerning its interpretation of life and death; both metaphysics and biologism are effects of the same contradiction. But Derrida sees Nietzsche suggest that both Being and beings are effects of life, which would mean that a metaphysical determination of life in terms of totality or beings as a whole would in fact be the principal target of his philosophy.[173] With respect to time, the thought of Return would be a non-metaphysical temporalization, one that might even anticipate, Derrida suggests, Heidegger's own displacement of the relation between Being and Time towards Time and Being.[174] With respect to humanization, Nietzsche's thought of Eternal Return would constitute the radical ex-appropriation of the human and a dehumanization of all organic and inorganic life. It might also displace Being as a question, anticipating the *Zusage* in the doubling of its affirmation; an originary response, a 'yes' anterior to the question.[175]

What Heidegger cannot abide for Derrida, whether in reading Nietzsche or anywhere else, is a thought of the contamination of the propriety of the question, death and authentic temporalization. Heidegger's move is particularly important here, because to save the unity and authenticity of Nietzsche's thought from Nazism, he encloses him in a metaphysics culminating in the absolute domination over the earth by human beings in technology, objectification and calculability. It is as if the entirety of Heidegger's reading operates in the différance between these two facets of the worst, with both biologism and metaphysics indeed coming down to one

another. The complicity between the two operates along what Derrida calls a "terrifying logic of contamination." If Heidegger can only break with Nazism by spiritualizing or metaphysicalizing life, Derrida wonders which is worse; a metaphysics or a biologism of race?[176] If the *Rector's Address* constitutes Heidegger at his most diabolical, it is because the risk of contamination is not just a risk run; "it is because, *without there being anything fortuitous in this*, it capitalizes on the worst, that is, on both evils at once: the sanctioning of Nazism, and the gesture that is still metaphysical." (DE 54/40) If the *Nietzsche* lectures constitute Heidegger's most direct critique of Nazism, the passage towards *Gelassenheit* and the *Zusage* away from the authenticity of the question, this is all the more reason to take his readings extremely seriously; to refuse the contamination of Nietzsche's thought, to read the affirmation of any thought in the singular, as pure expenditure without restriction, is itself the worst. One cannot save a thought by denying contamination,

> on the contrary, it must consist in assuming this law, in recognizing its necessity, in working from *within* the machine, by formalizing how contamination works and by attempting to act accordingly. Our very first responsibility is to recognize that this terrifying program is at work everywhere and to confront the problem head-on; not to flee it by denying its complexity but thinking it as such. (NII 236)

As Derrida recalls in *Of Spirit*, Heidegger attempts to shelter the propriety of the question from its contamination by technology. To posit an originary reactive technicity as irreducibly structuring the question is precisely what gives way to the *Zusage* and the doubling of affirmation for me. How might one understand contamination by the worst to save from the worst? Let me recall from chapter 3 that the possibility of an animal Dasein is refused since Dasein is defined by its access to the 'as such' of a being and thus to the possibility of the question. As early as *Of Spirit*, however, Derrida wonders if Dasein itself can question properly beyond its vital interests.[177] The difference between Heidegger and Nietzsche is that the latter would answer this question in the negative.

> Everything is in a perspective; the relation to a being, even the 'truest,' most 'objective,' that which respects most the essence of what is such as it is, is caught in a movement that we'll call here that of the living, of life, and from this point of view, whatever the difference between animals, it remains an 'animal' relation. (AS 219/160)

The relationship to the question of Being, the ontological difference, death as such, the capacity to let beings be, all of these would involve some mechanical and reactive ruse of life; a structural rather than subjective ruse.[178] As I showed in chapter 1, one of the fundamental metaphysical and

anthropocentric axioms for Derrida opposes the power of the free, active, ethical and responsible response of the human subject to the passive mechanical reaction and reactivity of nonhuman life. To think mechanicity as originary entails an entire rethinking of responsibility and the relations between life, death, the mechanical and the technological.[179]

The originary acquiescing of the *Zusage*, in its address to the other, must promise to repeat itself. Derrida joins Heidegger's thought of the *Zusage* with that of double affirmation in "Number of yes," in which he attempts both a quasi-transcendental and quasi-ontological analytic of the yes.[180] The time of the yes, one might say, overruns both the transcendental, Husserlian Living Present and the ontological, Heideggerian auto-affection of time, and requires another thought of time to think it. The 'yes' for Derrida makes possible both circular reappropriation and holds this circle open.[181] Double affirmation thus thinks both the cyclical propriation of time in the Living Present, auto-affective temporalization and also the 'perhaps' of the promise of the earth, perhaps as the cyclical return and the instant of Eternal Return. Any transcendental or ontological statement presupposes this 'yes,' but it is precisely through ontological-transcendental questioning that the 'yes' that exceeds and ruins their discourse in advance can be uncovered. Derrida defines Heidegger's *Zusage* precisely as a 'yes,' a pre-engagement presupposed by every question, language and speech. It is explicitly connected for Derrida to Heidegger's notion of *Gelassenheit*, which the former renders as a non-willing within willing. [182] Everything Heidegger associates with the words subjectivity, objectivity and calculability in the metaphysics of the Will is overrun by the 'yes,' which gives and promises the incalculable itself.[183] The 'yes,' for Derrida, is structured in a dimension of originary repetition. The first yes, the *Zusage*, promises, acquiesces but is also originarily a response. "It is *first second*, coming after a demand, a question, or another *yes*." (P2 247-8/239) It is mechanically doubled in advance, 'yes, yes,' contaminated by its very fatality;

> assigned in advance to its repetition. Since the second *yes* inhabits the first, the repetition augments and divides, splits in advance the arche-originary *yes*. This repetition, which figures the condition of an opening of the *yes*, threatens it as well: mechanical repetition... Between the two repetitions, the 'good' and the 'bad' there is both cut and contamination. (P2 248/240)

As Derrida puts it in "Nietzsche and the Machine,"

> A single 'yes' is, therefore, immediately double, it immediately announces a 'yes' to come and already recalls that the 'yes' implies another 'yes'... This immediate duplication is the source of all possible contamination, of that of the movement of

> freedom, of decision, of declaration, of inauguration, by its technical or technical double. (NII 247)

Derrida's development of the 'yes' and its double appears in *Life Death* and its the contemporaneous collection of essays on Blanchot collected in *Parages*, which introduce the concept of survivance itself. Here, Derrida links what one could call the *event* and *machine* of the yes, its saying and (re)-citation, its instant and cycle. In "Pas," the yes-event is read to affirm 'come' [*Viens*], preparing a space to let the other come, '*come in*.' However, the 'come' is always already a citation, a repeated affirmation in its first event. This is not due to any loss of authenticity of purity in the saying of yes, but rather engages "the force of affirmative repetition, on the self-affirming affirmation, that produces itself as the unique call [*appel*] to the to-come only as the will to repeat itself, to ally itself with itself in what it affirms, eternally. *Another thought of the eternal return*." (P 23/13*e*) This joyful affirmation of the 'yes,' 'come,' must nonetheless admit an "immeasurable unhappiness [*malheur sans mesure*]." (P 23/13) Because the 'yes' dislocates the space of any 'as such,' is not said to any subject or object, it can only be said "to what/whom is to come *again*, *again* that the eternal repetition will have always called from." (P 24/14) It says yes, Derrida puts it elsewhere, for the whole of life, but this 'whole of life' must be radically distinguished from any thought of totality or totalization, from beings as a whole, I'd add; it overflows both the logic of the whole and the logic of life.[184] It is furthermore impossible to distinguish between on the one hand the eternal repetition of the affirmation as Derrida reads it in Blanchot; double affirmation, Eternal Return, a new thought of citation, and on the other hand what one might call repetition and citation in the narrow sense, along a metaphysical concept of time.[185] The contamination between the event and machine of the yes is the risked and threatened structure of affirmation.[186] In 'Ulysses Gramophone,' after recalling that the yes names and describes nothing, Derrida writes that the 'yes' must be taken as a response to a request or question of the other, one that even detours through me.[187] In its address to the singular other, the repetition of the yes might be seen as necessarily escaping the forms of mechanicity and servility. But this contamination, again, is not accidental.

> In order for the *yes* of affirmation, assent, consent, alliance, of engagement, signature, or gift to have the value it has, it must carry the repetition within itself. It must *a priori* confirm its promise and promise its confirmation. This essential repetition lets itself be haunted by an intrinsic threat, by an internal telephone which parasites it like its mimetic, mechanical double. (UG 89/276)

This threat is indeed the condition for any life to live-on at all: if the possibility of the mechanical repetition of the 'yes' is refused, "there is no risk, and, if there is no risk, there is only death. If we refuse to take a risk, one is left with nothing but death." (NII 248) As such, he writes elsewhere, "the affirmation of life doesn't occur without the thought of death, without the most vigilant, responsible, and even besieged or obsessive attention to this end that does not happen – to happen." (PM 393/158) In the ring of the Eternal Return, the *reaffirmation* of life in the 'yes, yes',

> The *yes*, which says nothing, describes nothing but itself, the performance of its own event of affirmation, repeats itself, *cites* itself, says yes to itself as (to an-) other in accordance with the ring, re(-)cites a commitment that would not take place outside this repetition of a performance without presence. This strange ring says *yes* to life only in the overdetermining ambiguity of the triumph *de* ['of,' 'over'] life, *sur* ['over,' 'on,' etc.] life, the triumph marked in the *on* of living on [*le* sur *d'un survivre*]. (P 149/130)

Between the unconditional affirmation of the other, the infinite, joyful and rejoicing light, solar and airy affirmation of the eternal return, and the affirmation of radical evil, the repetition of the Christian donkey in Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*, overburdened with memory, there is only a difference of forces, in other words, it is the différance between the finite and infinite 'yeses' that is originary, designating the unstable stricture by which the force of the repetition of one yes can and must always haunt the other. The 'yes' of reactivity and repetition doubles the 'yes' of affirmation, the gift and the promise.[188] The double affirmation held together in the ring of Eternal Return for Derrida thus thoroughly problematizes Heidegger's interpretation; it is no more a new metaphysics of time than it is of the totality of beings. The doubling of Nietzsche's signature means that "the Eternal Return always involves differences of forces that perhaps cannot be thought in terms of being, of the pair essence-existence, or any of the great metaphysical structures to which Heidegger would like to relate them." (OA 65/46) And in this differantial of forces, one can read the originary possibility of contamination for Derrida as the place of Nietzsche's arche-ethics. In the law of inversion, not only can a reactive weakness become the strongest force, and vice versa, but force is itself revealed as a weakness. In this sense, "Nietzsche is coming to the aid of weakness, of an essential weakness." (NII 226) One can thus perhaps think in it the powerlessness necessary to think survivance and life death against the completion of immanence.

§4.4.2: The Transgression to Powerlessness

Let me engage this law of inversion in more detail, as it explicitly ties together the question of powerlessness I'm attempting to think here in relation to a certain blindness; one which alone can resist the technobiopolitical enframing I read in Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche and its grounding in the unification of *perceptio and appetitus* by which life secures the conditions of its preservation and enhancement. Inversion or conversion are not accidental for Derrida; "one *can*not, any more than one *must* not, have done with it. This is not a surpassable moment. It remains the structural condition of that which it must survive in making it possible: the sentence, the decision, the responsibility, the event, death itself." (PA 78/59) Ultimately, double affirmation and the co-contamination of the yeses overrun not only the transcendental and the ontological but all dialectics of propriation. Weakness, as Derrida writes, is perhaps what offers the greatest resistance to dialectics.[189] As I'd mentioned above, a structural, non-subjective ruse of life originarily contaminates the question of Being, as is the case with truth, objectivity and science – all of which are effects of life death for Derrida. On the one hand, life seeks truth to protect and to conserve itself, while on the other, and for these very reasons, it flees it. "There is therefore a truth that conserves or serves life, a truth that threatens or loses or kills it, there are therefore truths, and as soon as life is just as much what wants truth as what flees truth, there are lives, different and heterogeneous levels, qualities, forces of life, which guard, lose, or destroy themselves." (L7, 5*t*) Derrida here invokes Nietzsche's concept of dissimulation as a conservation instinct; beyond good and evil, truth and falsity operate in an extra-moral sense for life. The act of dissimulation attains its peak in the human for Nietzsche; lacking horns or the jaws of a beast of prey, dissimulation is a strategy by which the weakest become the strongest, it is "that by which life (the weakest... but force always being finite, force is always weakness somewhere)... defends and conserves itself: against truth, then, but also by way of truth." (L7, 6*t*) Dissimulation does not supervene upon life or a subject but constitutes it as the strategy of its sur-vival, all the way down to nature itself; "life here, *physis*, is not natural, a nature that dissimulates is not natural, even less so a nature that dissimulates dissimulation, it is a nature beyond the oppositions nature/artifice, nature/technology." (L7, 7*t*)

In the third session of *Life Death,* Derrida turns to two fragments from Nietzsche's *Will to Power* entitled 'anti-Darwin.' Darwinism for Nietzsche posits the survival of the fittest and strongest, while for his part claiming to see the average and sub-average dominate; it is in fact

the weakest that triumph in their championing of transcendent values.[190] "A very enigmatic possibility," Derrida writes, "how can force be stronger than itself? How can the weak be stronger than the strong?" (L3, 12*t*) This logic implies that a force of death is at work in and indeed as life itself, in the processes of the forces of life. Nietzsche criticizes Darwin for his *blindness* to "this transgression by life of its own law, to this strange logic of the Will to Power that selects in favour of the weakest, to this transgression of the law by itself, this transgression of the law being the law, making law (...) (the step/not beyond the law)." (L3, 12*t*) The debate is thus framed as a struggle for sight; Darwin and his school *see* and *want to see* natural selection operate in favour of the strongest, but are blind before the law as the inversion of the law. When Nietzsche argues that the ruse of life of the weak substitutes, replaces or supplements [*supplée*] the force of the strong, "this substituting relation [*rapport de suppléance*] of the least strong to the strongest, of the dead to the living, this relation between the most fecundity and the most mortality or destructibility are relations for which the usual logic of the relationships between life and death would have difficulty accounting." (L3, 14-5*t*) However, this blindness to the law's own inversion and transgression as its very principle is in fact an effect of the law itself *as life death*, "and finally of the law of the Eternal Return, insofar as it is blinding. Blinding in its brightness, but a brightness such that one can only blind themselves, wish to blind themselves before it." (L3, 14*t*)

"I am my father who is dead and my mother who is alive, announces Nietzsche at the mid-point of his life, in *Ecce Homo*, after passing through blindness."[191] (P 137/120) I'd shown, in Blanchot's reading of "Force and Signification" that since Plato, the metaphysics of form has always operated by limiting force, separating force from its sense in view of the *eidos*, while Derrida refuses to think force and weakness in terms of clarity and obscurity.[192] The *eidos*, I've also shown, dominates the entire epoch of metaphysics in determining *phusis* as *idea*, the logic that Heidegger holds responsible for the total dominion over the earth in its Nietzschean inversion into *perceptio*. I'd shown Blanchot imagine two types of invisibility, the simple inversion of the visible and an invisibility irreducible to its opposition to the visible. This radical invisibility, I argue, corresponds to a powerlessness within force itself. Force is precisely "not a power," but a ruse of life, it enjoins one "always to put oneself on the side of the weakest," in a passivity before which the word 'force' itself would be misleading. (NII 36) It is a necessary condition of the event, the arrivant and the future that we not *see* it coming; our experience of it

must necessarily be passive. Perspectivism, Derrida explains, means that things are always seen from a point of view, "according to an interest, in cutting out an outline of organized, hierarchized vision, an always selective outline that consequently owes as much to blindness as to vision." (PV 64*t*) A finite being is always blind to what is excluded from its perspective, it "can only see in a perspective, thus in a selective, excluding, framed manner, inside a frame, a border that excludes. Consequently, one must surround the visible placed in perspective by an entire zone of blindness." (PV 64*t*) The question of enframing seems irreducible here. Of course, however, this description corresponds to what I defined above as the restricted ecology of life; analogical appresentation in the restricted sense, a restricted autopoiesis, a dialectic and reciprocal immanence of form and norm, etc. Derrida even relates this precisely to the values of proximity, immediate presence, and interiority at stake in the form of the Living Present, indeed to a discussion of pure intuitionism running through Husserl, Bergson and Maine de Biran. There is a sight or vision that relates to an object present before me, according to the *eidos*, the contour of a visible form, but there is also an experience that is overflowed by someone or something in a visibility or invisibility infinitely exceeding the opposition of subject and object.[193] Beyond the oppositions of sensible and intelligible, active and passive, this 'a-perspectivism' would refer, following Blanchot and Levinas, to a passivity "more passive than passivity itself, ... this patience, this passion which delivers me over to what I receive renders me responsible for it." (PV 76-7*t*)

> There is a moment of absolute weakness and disarmament [that] ultimately means exposing ourselves to what we cannot appropriate... And this relation to the event or alterity, as well as to chance or the occasion, leaves us completely disarmed; and one has to be disarmed. This 'has to' says yes to the event: it is stronger than I am; it was there before me; the 'has to' is always the recognition of what is stronger than I. (TS 63)

I think this explains well why on the whole Derrida finds himself very suspicious of certain interpretations of the Will to Power, preferring like Foucault to speak of a Nietzschean differential force rather than Power with a capital P.[194] But the Will to Power appears to maintain a residue of voluntaristic metaphysics for Derrida, and even the term 'force' is one with which he feels uncomfortable.[195] The terms of force and power should only be used on three conditions for him: a) if there are only differences of force and power, b) if this differantial of force entails the possibility of the conversion of the strongest into the weakest, indeed into non-violence, and c) "that one takes into account, consequently, all the paradoxes and ruses of force, of power, of

mastery, as traps in which these ruses cannot avoid being caught up."[196] (LI /149) Even if one thinks a quasi-transcendental privilege of a drive to mastery, a Will to Power or domination [*emprise*] as he puts it in *The Post Card* – such as the economy of reappropriative immanence I showed in Derrida's account of the death drive – the structure of différance shows its essential vulnerability, its origin and limit.[197] What *resists* in the differantial structure constituting the Will to Power and the death drive, as Derrida closes the *Life Death* seminar, "would be the affirmation of life rather than the aspiration to return to the inorganic." (CP 436/408) To negotiate differantial relations of force and power indirectly, by way of a *detour*, as he puts it, instils a radical discontinuity within them that opens onto the ethical. The affirmation resulting from this detour would be beyond the death drive, power and sovereignty, "it comes then from a beyond the beyond, and thus from beyond the economy of the possible. It is attached to a life, certainly, but to a life other than that of the economy of the possible, an im-possible life no doubt, a sur-vival". (WA 276) In this detour lies a passive affirmation and acquiescence that, I argue, would *trans*-gress, indeed *trans*-cend the *oikos* of economy and ecology itself; one must think resistance as this *Transgression to Powerlessness*. To think any différance of force or power is to think these as always incalculably in excess of themselves, but this indestructible 'redoubling' of force is also an "'*incapacity*,' the strange passivity of an unpower [*impouvoir*] proceeding from this, that force is given, from the other received, received from the other to whom force is also given, whence the eternal ring [*anneau*], the endless annulment restarting an alliance without debt, a gift without credit." (P 24/13-4*t*) It is in the double bind of the two yeses that one is led to the space of the ethical that is "both disarmed and disarming." (NII 226)

§4.4.3: The Infinitely Finite Revenance of Différance

Let's recall that the originary ruse to dissimulation in life and nature by which all differential force inverts into weakness, *physis-in-différance* itself corresponds to the sameness of difference and repetition in the Eternal Return for Derrida.[198] In the *Life Death* seminar, he develops both its clearest definition and most difficult implication; both as the repetition and selection of becoming. To think repetition as selective, he adds, is as difficult as its contrary, how can a repetition *not* be selective?[199] The Eternal Return does not repeat the identical but operates selectively within a differential of forces.

> That which returns is the constant affirmation, the 'yes, yes'... that which signs here is in the form of a return, which is to say it has the form of something that cannot be simple. It is a selective return without negativity through affirmation, through alliance or marriage [*hymen*], that is, through an affirmation that is also binding on the other or that enters into a pact with itself as other. (OA 64/45)

The condition for anything in life to be affirmed, and particularly the eternal repetition of this affirmation, is a detour through the other at the heart of my self-relation. If I will that something returns to me eternally, my self-presence is no longer assured; "there is the necessity of this detour through the other in the form of the eternal return of that which is affirmed, of the wedding and the wedding ring, of the alliance... this 'yes, yes' has to be thought beginning with the eternal return." (OA 120/88) What does Derrida mean by this detour through the other? The passion of transgression I just mentioned is irreducible to any concept of the decision that would ground itself on subjective activity, calculation or will.[200] The *Zusage*, itself interpreted by Derrida as a non-willing within any willing, intersects here with Nietzsche's 'perhaps' [*Vielleicht*]. The *perhaps* opens up and keeps open any question, response or affirmation; I think it precisely resists the completion of immanence, "a perhaps of what *remains* to be thought, to be done, to be lived (to death)." (PA 58-9/38) The 'perhaps' is both a promise and fatality, implied in the coming of any event, *arrivance* or future that arrives *as* the impossible, beyond any horizon of predictability, and thus constitutes the only possible event. "This 'perhaps' is necessarily allied to a 'yes': yes, yes to whatever (whoever) arrives [(ce) *qui vient*]. This 'yes' would be common to the affirmation and the response; it would even come before any question." (NII 344) Furthermore, the 'perhaps' ensures the sur-vival of the response or question, keeping it alive. As he adds in a footnote, to think the impossible possible of the 'perhaps' and all its risks opens onto a thought of spectrality "*neither* living *nor* dead, but living *and* dead." (NII 399n2)

This spectrality must itself be thought in the temporality of Return, precisely as a *revenance*. Derrida engages the notion of revenance in *Parages* alongside the questions of survivance and double affirmation in his readings of Blanchot. The triumph *of* life that structures the equivocity of the –sur of survivance overflows both life and death; life death oscillates indeterminately between survivance and revenance.[201] In *Spectres of Marx*, Derrida draws attention to the multiple temporalities of the revenant; "no one can be sure if by returning it testifies to a living past or to a living future, for the *revenant* may already mark the promised return of the spectre of the living being." (SM 162/123) I've shown in Bataille and Blanchot that

the Eternal Return structures the possibility of affirmation on the condition it risk absolute evil, the disaster. This absolute evil for Derrida is itself an absolute life that does not know death. When I wrote in chapters 1 and 2 that the disjunction at the heart of the Living Present is the very condition of justice, it is because it allows for a temporalization that is hospitable to revenants as *arrivants*, and this would be precisely for me the temporalization of *revenance* hinted at in Derrida's readings of the Eternal Return. Furthermore, these seem to me to precisely structure Derrida's difficult concept of *selective* inheritance; if the unconditional affirmation of life were not bound to this condition of selection, radical evil would not simply be a risk run but precisely that which every affirmation would come down to. Even in the cycle of return, I'd say,

> inheritance is never gathered together, it is never one with itself. Its presumed unity, if there is one, can consist only in the *injunction* to *reaffirm* by *choosing*. 'One must' means *one must* filter, sift, criticize, one must sort out several different possibilities that inhabit the same injunction. And inhabit it in a contradictory fashion. (SM 40/18)

Life, Derrida says in *For What Tomorrow*, ought to be thought from this dual condition of inheritance and selection, "from this formal and apparent contradiction between the passivity of reception and the decision to say 'yes,' then to select, filter, interpret and therefore transform; not to leave intact or unharmed, not to leave *safe* the very thing one claims to respect before all else." (DQ 16/4) As I'd shown in chapter 1, this dissymmetry in inheritance is the condition of letting life live-on at the heart of biocultural sustainability.[202]

A selective reaffirmation of what returns is only possible on the condition of finitude; the infinite and eternal does not select. The injunction to select what returns is structured in the differing and deferral of différance, which I'll recall from chapter 2 is infinitely finite for Derrida. Différance is precisely the condition of a just affirmation; "deferring not what it affirms but deferring just *so as to* affirm, to affirm *justly*, so as to have the power (a power without power) to affirm the coming of the event, its future-to-come itself." (SM 41/19) The affirmative transgression to powerlessness and the infinitely finite revenance of différance might just be the double necessary for thinking the promise of the Earth, the passivity and humility of its affirmation. "Every *revenant* seems here to come from and return to *the earth*... to return to it as to the lowest, towards the humble, humid, humiliated."[203] (SM 154/116-7)

Let me return to the line from Celan that has preoccupied my last two chapters; the world is gone away, I must carry you. I'd mentioned in a note that even Levinas, in his book on Blanchot, seems to warn against reading the 'carrying' therein as that of a beast of burden. But

the donkey that infinitely repeats 'yes' is intimately bound to the structure of double affirmation; the possibility that the 'yes' fall into its mechanical repetition is the very condition of possibility of the coming of the other, the event, the future. Derrida evokes a possible Nietzschean ruse of life at the heart of acting *as if* we shared a world. If the world has gone away, either I must carry you in the void or act as if there were a world, bring the world to life and give birth to it so that I may give it to you.[204] To give the world would not issue from a transcendent imperative, the alleged 'infinitization' therein would still belong to the economy of a ruse; another thought of infinity is called upon. "One would have to think the dissymmetry of a gift without exchange, therefore an infinite one – infinitely disproportionate, in any case, however modest it may be, from the vantage point of terrestrial finitude. From under its horizon without horizon." (PA 318/286) Zarathustra does not give a gift in just any economy, "he gives a world, he gives all, he gives that in which all gifts may appear, and, like all gifts, this gift of the world must nevertheless be determined: it is *this* world, a completed world." (PA 319/287) The economy of reciprocity and its values of completion, finitude, homology and immanence – nonetheless necessary so that the gift of the world appear – themselves give way to the infinite, incompleteness, the dissymmetrical, heterology and transcendence.[205] To think this rupture within immanence, one is again returned by Derrida to Bataille, Blanchot, Levinas and also to Nietzsche, "although we are already invited to think a proximity of the distant to which Zarathustra called us... and always under the neutral and non-dialectizable law of the '*pas*' and the 'X without X.'" (PA 328/296)

The '*without*,' as I'd covered it in *Parages*, is infinitely passive and originarily affected by the wholly other. I'd argued that it operates as the condition of any community or ecology, calling it a relationality without relationality where the other remains absolutely transcendent.[206] As originary forms of repetition, "the *pas* or the *trans* – always already have the form of the return. It begins by returning, in tending towards the annulment of its own process. As is the progress of the proper that lets itself be enmeshed by this circular ring." (CP 424/397*t*) The double logic of the *pas*, he adds in *Parages*, operates "according to the eternal return of the passive transgression and of the repeated affirmation." (P 59/46) The event of any affirmation or 'perhaps' is thus structured through the originary detour of the other, what Derrida calls a passive decision in *The Politics of Friendship*, an originarily *affected* decision without any activity, willing, subjectivity or freedom, within which I am "exposed, sensitive, receptive, vulnerable."

(PA 87/68) The detour of time in the Eternal Return is thus the very condition of the affirmation of life since it affirms both the death that circulates within discourses of possibility and power, the death that my personal life survives, the cycle of life and death and the impossible instant of my death, the impersonal death that is impossible for me to die and that I share differentially with all living beings. This is precisely Derrida's point in *Demeure: Fiction and Testimony*. The detour in the turning of time structures the instant of death for any living being as an unexperiencable experience, an experience of the impossible. In this co-passion before death lies the ground of compassion with other mortals. The ring of Eternal Return binds the possible, cyclical, repetitive time of death to the impossible time of the selective instant of my death. It engages affirmation of life in its lightness, gaiety and beatitude, but a life without life; survivance, revenance. Blanchot's logic of the 'spectral' *without* binds double affirmation.

> 'to live without living [*vivre sans vivant*],' 'to die without death [*mourir sans mort*,' 'death without death,'... Life has freed itself from life; one might just say as well that life has been relieved of life. A life that simply stops is neither weighty nor light. Nor is it a life that simply continues. Life can only be light from the moment it stays dead-living without being freed, that is to say, released from itself. A life without life, an experience of lightness, an instance of 'without,' a logic without logic of the 'X without X,' or of the '*pas*.' (DB 120-1/89)

This is precisely where Ariadne returns, weaving together both the carrying of the other and the passion of affirmation in the powerlessness and vulnerability we share with all living beings. A passion holding "for everything from which the tissue of living experience is woven, through and through. A weave of survival, like death in life or life in death... they live and die, they live to death as the very inextricability of this weave... Groundless ground of this quasi-transcendentality of living to death or of death as sur-vivance."[207] (BS2 195/132)

I'd begun this chapter by taking very seriously, as does Derrida, the necessity of a passage through Heidegger that Derrida faults Deleuze and Foucault for avoiding. Despite the value of propriation Derrida sees as ubiquitous in Heidegger's work, the fact that the metaphysical thinking of life in Heidegger's reading of the Will to Power and the biologistic thinking of life in Nazism end up being two species of the same contradiction gives one so much to think concerning any affirmative theory of life grounded in "pure 'transcendental life,' 'absolute immanence' '(...) the pure life of the 'living,' (...) the immanence of 'feeling oneself alive.'" (FF 16-7*t*) Particularly if one takes seriously, as I do, the essential complicity these concepts share with the objectification, calculation and mechanization of all living and nonliving

matter on earth in view of its use-value, and all the biopolitical implications this would have. With Deleuze and Bataille, however, I had come to see a thought of immanence structured by double affirmation, the Outside, a resistance anterior to the opposition of activity and passivity, a double death and the expenditure without reserve exceeding all economic propriation. Particularly through Blanchot and Derrida's readings of the Eternal Return, I'd thus tried to develop double affirmation as essentially *selective*. But even whatever mechanical ruse may lie at the heart of this selectivity always affirms itself through the detour of the other in its infinite transcendence. This is why animmanence can't frontally oppose any classical philosophy of immanence but only protest gently against its completion, resisting differentials of force and power from the transcendence of a survivance beyond the beyond. To let life live-on, to let the earth be the earth. How then, might one think beyond the epoch of what Lawlor calls the bio-will to power and its complicity with planetary domination? Precisely through thinking life in its passivity and powerlessness, as he suggests, but in the incompleteness of animmanence, in the doubly affirmative deconstruction of biopolitics.

"To see death in life [*voir dans la vie la mort*]."

Michel Foucault, *Birth of the Clinic*, 237/170.

Five: Biopolitics and Double Affirmation v5.0[1]: Step/Nots Beyond an Ecology of the Commons

Let me begin by recalling Lawlor's suggestion of a similarity if not identity between Heidegger's interpretation of Nietzsche's Will to Power and Foucault's biopower.

> First, both occur in the modern epoch, which is the epoch of anti-Platonism. Second, both conceptions, being modern, imply a transformation of vision into positing and constant presence. Third, biopower and will to power are commanding, meaning that the will in each conception super-enhances the power it already has; bio-will to power is the will to more and more power (*super* abundant life). Finally, both Heidegger and Foucault associate the phenomenological concept of *Erlebnis* with bio-will to power.[2]

I showed that Heidegger reads the Will to Power as culminating in the total technological enframing, calculation and objectification of the Earth and its living and nonliving beings in view of their and use-value. As Mick Smith argues in a rare conjunction of biopolitical thought and environmental philosophy, the ecological implications of biopolitics must be interpreted "in terms of parallels between the biopolitical reduction of people to bare life and the biopolitical reduction of more-than-human nature to resource, to 'standing reserve.'"[3] "*It is the reduction of the world to a standing reserve that threatens to reduce humans to the status of 'bare life.'* This threat is not just a dystopic possibility but ... already constitutes the 'hidden matrix' of contemporary (bio)politics."[4]

For Heidegger, the metaphysical determination of life and the human as *animal rationale* and the Nazi biologization of life are mutually constitutive possibilities. One could say a similar concern underlies the critique of the concepts of human rights and personhood as a resistance to biopower, and also the extension of such rights to nonhuman living beings. Such extensions, the argument goes, are merely reiterative of the conceptual scaffolding responsible for their domination. While expressing sympathy for their intentions, animal rights are fundamentally unworkable for Derrida since the concept of rights is itself structured on the logic of a human subject as the bearer of rights and duties, bound to a logic of representation.[5] In environmental ethics, the moral considerability of nonhumans has also problematically been premised on revealing similarities in shared characteristics and purposes between humans and nonhumans. At worst, Smith writes, "our self-concern becomes the basis for a (supposedly) ethical concern for

others deemed sufficiently like us."[6] Other trends in environmental philosophy have tried to counter this extensionist logic by thinking the ontological and the ethical as bound up one with the other. Similarly, certain areas in biopolitical literature have attempted to think the 'form' and 'norm' of life *together* in their resistance to biopower, rather than submitting life to the transcendence of a norm or axiologically extending a logic of rights to non-human beings.

However, how one thinks this 'together' as I've argued, can result in two quite different streams of interpretation. In this chapter, I'll contrast 'affirmative biopolitics' with another thought of resistance to biopolitics along the selective and differentiating lines of double affirmation.[7] However, I'll do this less by developing double affirmation itself, seeing these reflections in close conversation with those in chapter 4, and using the term more to flag both the risk of its continuity with affirmative biopolitics and what it resists therein. While affirmative biopolitics emphasizes the reciprocal immanence of the form and norm of life, affirming biopolitics itself as the active and creative production of new subjectivities and events, I follow Derrida in thinking the relation between the descriptive and normative, constative and performative along a wholly other logic as the passive *invention* of the other: the experience of the impossible. Affirmative biopolitics, I'll show, at worst biopolitically and ecologically replicates the Nietzsche Heidegger criticizes, proposing a metaphysics (or at least an ontology) of life against a biologism of life that ultimately come down to one another, an inverted Platonism where the affirmation of the immanent powers of this world become indistinguishable from and indeed complicit with the flows of biopolitical and technoscientific capitalism.[8] In this chapter, I emphasize the interplay between sovereign power, the power to *let* live and *make* die, and biopower, the power to *make* live and *let* die, both of which can be deemed figures of biopolitical sovereignty culminating in Nazism.[9] The space for an affirmative response to these structures, I argue, lies in Foucault's concept of resistance, but it is unclear for now if or why this resistance ought be called 'biopolitics,' unless one were to radically reinscribe its sense by way of its 'impolitical' underside. The thought of the impolitical I'm interested in developing here has more to do with the 'Politics After!' approach Derrida discusses regarding Levinas in *Adieu*, a beyond-within of (bio)politics, a thought of (bio)politics to be *invented*, a peace of the living overflowing the political that does not come down to the non-political.[10] Foucault and Esposito, particularly in their works on Bataille and Blanchot on the questions of transgression, the Outside and community do precisely this.[11] If biopolitics undergoes such an inversion, I'd feel

justified in arguing for a biopolitics of double affirmation. If affirmative biopolitics concerns itself with the creative actions, activities, capacities, capabilities, forces, possibilities and powers of the living, double affirmation engages the radical passivity of a mortal finitude shared across the living in general, a non-power at the heart of power beyond the opposition of activity and passivity. If affirmative biopolitics thinks the active resistance of life to biopower as a counter-power, double affirmation thinks resistance as what Deleuze calls a third term outside the traditional opposition of power and resistance, force and counter-force, affecting and being affected.[12] If affirmative biopolitics thinks *making live* otherwise, the biopolitics of double affirmation calls forth a *letting live-on*, anterior to the oppositions of making and letting live and die structuring sovereign power and biopower. It thus proposes an ethics and an ontology of life that breaks from the conceptual complicity between Nazi biologism, a metaphysics of life and ecological domination towards a more just thought of life death on earth.[13]

On the ecological front, the danger with much of affirmative biopolitics is its culmination within what Smith calls a hybrid panpsychism inattentive to the differences between living beings.[14] The same critique holds in Cary Wolfe's reading of Esposito, whose affirmative biopolitics result in a biocentric 'dedifferentiating discourse of life,' "a sort of neovitalism that ends up radically differentiating the field of 'the living' into a molecular wash of singularities that all equally manifest 'life.'"[15] Affirmative biopolitics and biocentrism are thus similarly problematic; like the axiological extensionism based on a discourse of rights and the person, Smith writes, "these purportedly biocentric approaches change the content but retain the form, the same anthropocentrically self-obsessed locus, of the dominant ethical field."[16] The affirmative biopolitics posited by Hardt and Negri, even within what they call an ecology of the commons, remains fundamentally human-centered. Conversely, "posthuman politics must avoid dissolving individual ethical and political responsibilities in amorphous hybrid systems or networks."[17] What is needed in resisting biopolitics is an ethics of difference; "an ecological difference ethics... potentially offers a radical alternative to all attempts to enclose the nonhuman in an economy of the Same."[18]

When Lawlor writes that both Heidegger's critique of Nietzsche and Foucault's biopower are directed at a concept of life as *Erlebnis*, positing the mutual phenomenological immanence of transcendental and empirical life, the reciprocal immanence of the form and norm of life together in '*le vécu*,' Foucault draws from Canguilhem in proposing a thought of '*le vivant*' that

maintains a hiatus between the empirical and the transcendental. This is more or less what I discussed as the ultratranscendental concept of life in chapter 2. I've tried to show organic life as existing in differentially structured worlds via what I called their auto-hetero-transcendences in temporalization, alterity, materiality and death, carrying over from the most elementary lifeforms to the most complicated epistemological, linguistic and affective-creative relations of the human and beyond. Wolfe speaks of the living being as constituted by a double finitude, "not just the finitude of being an embodied, mortal being, of 'being toward death,' but also a second kind of finitude – the radical exteriority and technicity of any semiotic system – that makes the first form of finitude *inappropriable* and unavailable to us."[19] This double finitude, he writes, traverses the life-death relation, and is correlated to the *Zusage* and the 'yes, yes' of double affirmation I covered in chapters 3 and 4.[20] Smith also writes of *Gelassenheit* as the only possible resistance to biopolitics.

> to let something be is to hold open the possibilities of beings appearing in ways that are significant while not simply conforming to our expectations, desires, or definitions. It is to recognize that a being has such potential significance because it transcends (goes beyond) what we would otherwise make of it... To let be, then, is not necessarily to leave alone but to be in community with.[21]

At stake here will be precisely this thought of ecological community and the relations of passivity, powerlessness and finitude that make relationality impossible; a transcendence within immanence that interrupts absolute relationality and affirms an ethics of radical differentiation of all life on earth; an ecological relationality without relationality.

In §5.1, I situate Derrida's notion of ethics with respect to the laws and norms structuring sovereign power and biopower, but also ethico-politico-juridical performatives and technoscientific knowledge, and show how ecological justice must think something irreducible to these. Rather, ethics thinks the condition of ecological relationality in terms of a performative powerlessness, an event it must let come beyond any modifications of activity and passivity. In §5.2, I turn to Foucault, and begin in §5.2.1 by examining the passages between sovereign power and biopower and their conjunction within Nazism. How then, is one to think a resistance that is not immediately recuperated into these dialectics of life and death? In §5.2.2, I suggest that the reconceptualization of life that permitted its entry into biopower also discloses something referring knowledge and power over life to their impossibility in Foucault's readings of Canguilhem, Cuvier and Bichat. I then examine the ethical implications of these in §5.2.3

through Foucault's readings of the Eternal Return, Bataille's transgression and Blanchot's thought of the Outside to uncover a logic of resistance entirely coherent with the movements of the *pas au-delà*, the *without* and double affirmation. My thesis in §5.3, however, is that Hardt and Negri's affirmative biopolitics propose a thought of life that remains very close to that critiqued by Heidegger via Nietzsche, and thus caught up in the dialectics between a biologism and metaphysics of life. I show this in §5.3.1 by correlating their understanding of the plane of immanence precisely with the inverted Platonism Heidegger reads as entailing human dominion over the earth. In §5.3.2, I examine their distinction between power, *potestas* and biopower on the one hand and resistance, *potentia* and biopolitics on the other. The fact that the latter operate totally immanently to the former remains incapable of thinking resistance, I argue, and their specific position against deconstruction and *Gelassenheit* structures these closely to the radical killing Heidegger reads in Nietzsche's thought of valuation. I conclude in §5.3.3 by suggesting that what Hardt and Negri propose as living labour within the ecology of the commons bears more of a resemblance to the machine economy in which Heidegger sees Nietzsche's thought culminate.

In §5.4, I turn to the work of Esposito and the radically different affirmative biopolitics he proposes. Esposito acknowledges a shift, or rather a progressive superimposition from his earlier 'deconstructionist' 'impolitical' approach towards a more constructive, Deleuzian one of constructing concepts.[22] Perhaps everything involved in thinking the relation between biopolitics and double affirmation reads this progression backwards, grounding the later stage in the former via Bataille and Blanchot. I begin in §5.4.1 by examining the break he proposes in the dialectics between a metaphysics and biologism of life, sovereign power and thanatopolitics by inverting what he calls immunization, the negation of life in its self-protection, into an affirmation of life. I then in §5.4.2 argue that if his turn to Spinoza, Simondon and Deleuze bears some similarities to Hardt and Negri's affirmative biopolitics and risks a dedifferentiating discourse of life, Esposito also thinks life in its passivity, vulnerability and finitude. In §5.4.3, I show how his earlier readings of Bataille and Blanchot radically invert this dedifferentiating tendency towards a sharing of the earth with its others while having nothing in common but the impossible relation to death, which comes down to a deconstructive affirmation of life.

§5.1: Derrida: Performative Powerlessness and the Event of Ecology

One could say that two logics of the event are at stake between affirmative biopolitics and the biopolitics of double affirmation. On the one hand, I'd call affirmative biopolitics 'performative' in something of a restricted sense, as the enactment of the necessary and sufficient conditions to actualize and counteractualize events, the singular affirmation of the immanent powers of life enabling the *creation* of new subjectivities and events. The *invention* of the other, on the other hand, thinks together both the machine and event of the 'yes,' the restricted economy/ecology between the performative and constative, normative and descriptive, ethical and ontological and the event that transcends and exceeds these. In "From Restricted to General Economy," Derrida indeed speaks of the gaiety of an affirmation beyond the economy of life, exceeding philosophical logic itself by way of Foucault's 'non-positive affirmation' in "The Preface to Transgression."[23] Ethics itself for Derrida comes from a performative powerlessness.

> To this inherited theological fantasy of sovereignty, I would oppose an unconditionality without power. And it is there, in this 'without power,' that I expose myself to the event, to the arrival of an event for which no performative is ready. For which no legitimating convention is provided. And it is to this arrival that the ethical question presents itself, that the call of the other, the arrival of the other, of an event, is a burden [*charge*], an infinite responsibility. This is not to say that I assume it myself. *I cannot assume responsibility*. I know simply that I cannot assume the responsibility that overwhelms me. I am infinitely overwhelmed as a finite being by a responsibility that cannot but be infinite – and impossible to assume. But at least I *think* this impossibility, and it is there that I *think* what my responsibility should be, which is to say, infinite. (PC 468)

Performative powerlessness also resists the sovereignty of the death drive and its attempt to reappropriate every material transcendence into the propriety and property of its immanence.[24] In thinking a beyond of the power principle with

> a death drive that was no doubt not simply alien to the drive for power or the drive to mastery (...) to what is most alive in life, to its very living on [*survivance*]," Foucault "would have associated and yet also dissociated, he would have placed back to back, mastery and death, that is, the same – death *and* the master, death *as* the master.[25] (RP 146/266)

Foucault seems to think something beyond death and power for Derrida. And if, as Deleuze suggests, Foucault gets stuck on the possibility of an outside to power, trapped inside something he hates, it is in Foucault's thought of the double, the Outside, and this *beyond* or the *pas au-delà* of power that one must seek a life's resistance beyond biopolitical sovereignty.[26]

Derrida, however, is often quite impatient with "everything that we call today in such a confused manner a bio-power," arguing, as I will explain below, that biopower is an 'arch-ancient thing,' bound up with the very logic of sovereignty.[27] (PM2 69*t*) I think this has to do with the structural homology between metaphysical concepts of making and letting. Even if the difference between sovereign power and biopower passes through making and letting live and die, if both remain committed to a classical determinations of *energeia/dynamis,* agent/patient, act/passion, act/power and the possible, form/matter, then sovereign power and biopower, and along with them the affirmative biopolitics that would resist, create and act otherwise would not only constantly risk coming down to one another but at worst serve to mutually reinforce one another. The following has important ecological implications as well: if it can be shown that affirmative biopolitics still grounds itself in the act, in making live and letting die, one ought seriously entertain Derrida's suggestion that every letting die might be a making die.[28] This of course concerns nonhuman living beings as well; "who can know how many people or living beings they will have killed without knowing it throughout their life?" (PM2 114*t*) What makes this making/letting die, whatever its modification, so intolerable, Derrida asks?

> It's that the death that one thus makes or lets come is not the end of this or that, this one or that one, who or what *in the world*. Each time something dies, it's the end of the world. Not of a world, but the world, the whole of the world, the infinite opening of the world. And this is true of any living being, from the tree to the protozoa, the mosquito to the human, death is infinite, it is the end of the infinite, the finite of the infinite... It is end of the world that is without equivalent, that has so little equivalent that with respect to the death of the least living being the absolute end of the world or, if you prefer, the only destruction of the earth and of terrestrial humanity changes nothing, aggravates nothing, remains in any case incommensurable. (PM2 118-9*t*)

Making/letting die culminate each time in the end of the world, the destruction of the earth, and thus overflows any distinction between a shared earth and different worlds. Derrida writes of the socio-economic and techno-scientifico-capitalist machines that condemn these billions of living beings to death, both in term of condemning countless species to death unconsciously and in the ethico-judicial-political performatives legitimizing these.[29] Capitalist violence, indissociable from its technoscientific, biological, genetic, medical and pharmaceutical aspects,

> is the very site where the distinction between the actual and virtual, active and passive, intentional and non-intentional, the act and its other, in a word, where this distinction becomes blurred, where everything is done so that this distinction is blurred... Where there is capital, the distinction between act and non-act, active and passive, actual and

> virtual, the act and desire, activity and non-activity, labour and non-labour, etc., all these distinctions between the act and its others lose all credit. (PM2 268*t*)

Biocide, zoocide and ecocide thus all rely on this structural homology between sovereign power and biopower, making-letting live and die, the thanatopolitical and biopolitical, a homology capitalism not only makes possible but seeks to continually reinforce.

As I noted above, Lawlor and Wolfe suggest that a resistance to biopower that would not immediately be returned to its mechanisms of force and power ought to think the living being both in its own mortal finitude and the finitude of the relations in which it structures its environment, as I've similarly argued throughout. But I have yet to fully flesh out how the impossible *invention* of the other gives itself to think the letting live-on, anterior to the opposition of activity and passivity that concerns me here. In "Psyche: Invention of the Other," Derrida suggests that invention only takes place through repetition, but at the same time in breaking from this economy in order to let the other come.[30] Invention and the event are only possible beyond the oscillation between the performative and the constative. As I will show, affirmative biopolitics rests on a concept of activity within which the performative, in the citation of its conventions, is both the necessary and sufficient condition of the event, the invention of new possibilities of life and the production of new subjectivities. The difficulty with such an account, however, is its commitment to what Derrida calls a "techno-epistemo-anthropocentric dimension" linking "within a system of conventions, a metaphysics to technoscience and to humanism." (P1 37/25) As he understands it, the performative is necessary but not sufficient to let the event come, since it rests too strongly on political, technoscientific and institutional conventions, just as all theories of the performative appeal to some legitimating power.[31] The performative, as he puts it in *Rogues*, is "a power for some 'I' guaranteed by conventions that neutralize the pure eventfulness of the event, and inasmuch as the eventfulness of the to-come exceeds this sphere of the performative."[32] (V 123/84) This is the same reason Derrida is suspicious of the extension of what he calls juridical performatives such as rights to nonhumans. While law, rights and norms belong to the economy of the calculable and possible, justice must be thought in the element of non-knowledge, the incalculable and im-possible. Rights, in other words, offer a resistance to biopower that remains caught up in its mechanisms – "it is one sovereignty set against another. Human rights pose and presuppose the human being (who is equal, free, self-determined) as sovereign. The declaration of Human Rights declares

another sovereignty." (V 128/89) Of course, no one is arguing that there should not be norms in deciding on ethico-politico-juridical responsibilities, but rather that responsibility itself must also involve a certain heterogeneity, indeed an aneconomic relation with respect to the norm. Infinite responsibility must be thought as this overloading and overwhelming of the economy of the norm.

> One cannot eliminate the overload and control things by norms... When there are norms, it's over, everything is done, everything follows from the norms. There is no more responsibility when there are norms. Thus, if one wants to normalize, to norm the ethical overload, it's over, there is no more ethics. There is ethics precisely when I am in performative powerlessness. (PC 467)

One must invent norms so that there can be responsibility, but these cannot be reduced to their techno-scientific programming and calculability; they must not produce experts.[33] *The norm must be lacking*, and this lack of norm is not only the condition of responsibility but all knowledge, technoscientific or otherwise.[34] This applies not only to biopolitics but also to what I'll examine in science and technology studies, translation studies and ecolinguistics in chapter 6. It will thus be necessary to investigate these overlaps between knowledge and power in their complicity with the question about *dynamis*,

> about a force and a power but also about the possible and its limits, about the possible and the impossible, about a sovereign 'I can' and an 'I cannot,' about the potential and the virtual; we must let this question resonate wherever what is at stake is the calculable and the incalculable in ethical, juridical, and political reason to be sure, but also, inseparably, in the technical reason of what is called a bit too quickly today the 'virtual' in the technosciences, biopolitics, and so on. (V 191/137)

If affirmative biopolitics affirms the creative *possibilities* of the living, and asks 'what can a body do,' the double affirmation of life inquires about something else: the experience and invention of the impossible and the other.[35] Again, what I'm proposing does not *oppose* itself to affirmative biopolitics, which would dialectically return it to its mechanisms, but rather awaits the invention of the other beyond any horizon of anticipation or expectation.[36] To let the other come, however, cannot be thought in the classical determination of activity and passivity; one lets it come by getting ready for it.[37] Nor can the invention of the other be reduced to a subjective or objective genitive: the other's invention or the invention of the other. "To get ready for the coming of the other is what can be called deconstruction. It deconstructs precisely this double genitive and, as deconstructive invention, itself comes back in the step [*pas*] – and also as the

step – of the other." (P1 53-4/39) Decision and affirmation, I showed in chapter 4, are originarily passive and affected by the other.[38] In overflowing ethico-juridico-political and bio-techno-scientific performatives, justice allows no horizon within which to expect it, and this lack of horizon is itself the condition of the open future-to-come and the coming of the other.[39] Justice is beyond a future that would be a mere modification of presence. As I showed in my discussion of Nietzsche, justice is committed to this 'perhaps,' since the event of justice can only come from a future beyond calculation and programmability.[40] The non-dialectical negation of the *pas* and the 'perhaps' intersect in the vulnerability, weakness and passivity of letting the event come. "The *pas,* the movement of a *pas* that consists in suspending, with a 'who knows' (*wer weiss)* and with so many 'perhaps's' (*veilleicht*), [suspending] the authority of a sure knowledge... All the 'perhaps's' that multiplied in order to do right by, and justice to, the possibility of the *pas* and advent of the event." (BS1 374/278-9) While the possible, calculation, law and performativity are always of the order of power and sovereignty, Derrida refers to the unpredictable event as a weak force. "This vulnerable force, this force without power, opens up unconditionally to what or who *comes* and comes to affect it. The coming of this event exceeds the condition of mastery and the conventionally accepted authority of what is called the 'performative.'" (V 13/xiv) What Derrida calls the messianicity of awaiting is not a power, but a vulnerability and absolute powerlessness.[41] "The one to whom this is happening, the living one – animal or human – must not have any mastery over it, whether performative or some other kind." (FSC 67-8)

It is important – and this will be essential to thinking the community without community of ecological relationality, the *pas* beyond the ecology of the commons – that what Derrida calls the structure of messianicity, the promise of a democracy to-come is not utopian, but rather refers "in every here-now, to the coming of an eminently real, concrete event, that is, to the most irreducibly heterogeneous otherness." (MS 69/248) The awaiting of messianicity is an "affirmation of an un-predictable future-to-come (or even of a past-to-come again), the experience of the non-present, of the non-living present in the living present (of the spectral), of that which lives on [*du sur-vivant*] (absolutely past or absolutely to-come, beyond all presentation or representability)." (MS 78/254). As I showed in chapters 1 through 3, Derrida sees Freud's death drive, Husserl's Living Present and Heidegger's temporalization as incapable of thinking what he calls the promise of the Earth in "Avances." The vulnerability and weakness of performative powerlessness, however, invites us to think this promise,

> (but also of the threat at the heart of the promise)... [and], at the point of intersection with this threatening promise, the horizon of an awaiting [*attente*] that informs our relationship to time – to the event, to that which happens [*ce qui arrive*], to the one who arrives [*l'arrivant*] and to the other. Invoked with this time, however, would be an awaiting *without* waiting, a waiting whose horizon is, as it were, punctured by the event (which is waited for *without* being awaited). (MS 72/250-1)

The passivity of this awaiting will be the only condition for thinking a letting live-on, irreducible to the making-letting-live-die of the play of sovereign and bio-techno-power, and thus also, perhaps, the only way to think life in its mortal finitude in an ecology resisting dedifferentiation, having the experience of an impossible death as the very condition of a differentiated relationality. In this underside to biopolitics, the promise of the earth will not be that of a 'we' of human subjects, but another 'we' that

> can be invented only by the other and from the coming of the other that says 'come' and to which a response with another 'come' appears to be the only invention that is desirable and worthy of interest. The other is indeed what is not inventible, and it is therefore the only invention in the world, the only invention of the world, *our* invention, the invention that invents *us*. For the other is always another origin of the world and *we are to be invented*. And the being of the we, and being itself. Beyond being. (P1 60/45)

This ecology-to-come, the *step-not beyond* an ecology of the commons, "is indeed on the side of chance, that is, the side of the incalculable *perhaps*, and toward the incalculability of another thought of life, of what is living in life, that I would like to venture here under the old and yet still completely new and perhaps unthought name *democracy*." (V 24/5)

§5.2: Foucault: Resistance, Mortalism and the Outside

§5.2.1: Making and Letting Live and Die

As is well known, Foucault conceives of the passage between sovereign power and biopower as occurring between the right to let live and make die and the norm of making live and letting die. Biopower, he argues, consists of nothing less than the entry of life itself into the fields of power-knowledge. While conceding that life and history had been in contact with one another for millennia, Foucault suggests that developments in biology and medicine have allowed mankind to place the imminence of death at a distance through a certain mastery over life. For the first time in history, life and biological existence becomes something knowledge can control and within which power can intervene.[42] At what he calls 'the threshold of biological modernity,' biopower is born: "for millennia, man remained what he was for Aristotle: a living animal with

the additional capacity for a political existence; modern man is an animal whose politics places his life as a living being in question." (VS 188/143*t*) As Derrida argues in *The Beast and the Sovereign*, however, these two definitions are perfectly reciprocal and complementary. Not that there are no novelties or changes in the mechanisms of power over life, but biopower must be understood as far more ancient than modernity and intimately bound to the notion of sovereignty.[43] If Nazism comes to constitute the unification of sovereignty and biopower within what might be called biopolitical sovereignty, the total dialectical interplay of making and letting live and die, one wonders how any affirmative biopolitical resistance would not get caught up in its mechanisms.

At a first glance, Foucault seems to posit resistance as operating solely within a differential field of forces. Power is not a system of domination or the sovereignty of the state or law, nor does it issue from a central sovereign agency but rather everywhere subtends the always moving and unstable relations between forces.[44] Cohering with the differential of forces in Nietzsche, Freud, Deleuze and Derrida I called a restricted economy or ecology of power, resistance is also at work in any power relation. "Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, *this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power*." (VS 126/95*e*) But to understand this implying that power is inescapable and has no outside is to misunderstand the relational character of power relations for Foucault. Points of resistance are multiple, at work everywhere in relations of power, not as their simply passive underside but as an irreducible opposition to power inscribed within its every relation.

Foucault defines sovereign power as the right to decide the life and death of its subjects.[45] Unlike Derrida, he does not read sovereign power as absolute but conditioned by the defense and survival of the sovereign, in turn ensuring the survival of its subjects. The sovereign may ask its subjects to expose their lives to death in war, but has a direct power over the lives of those who break its laws and are punishable by death. There is an asymmetry in the sovereign power to life and death that skews toward the latter; "the sovereign exercised his right of life only by exercising his right to kill, or by refraining from killing. The right which was formulated as 'of life and death' was in reality the right to *make* die or to *let* live." (VS 178/136*t*) Life and death are not to be understood here as the natural phenomena outside political power; the subject's life or death themselves are granted or denied by sovereign power.[46] Power is to be understood as a 'right of seizure' on life by which life can then be suppressed.[47] It is never a question of making

live for sovereign power; its power over life exerts itself only insofar as it can kill. "It is not the right to make die or make live. Nor is it the right to let live and to let die. It is the right to make die and let live." (IF 214/240-1*t*)

Between the classical and modern periods, Foucault believes to have found what he calls a profound transformation in the mechanisms of power. Sovereign power, dedicated to the impeding, submission and destruction of forces becomes one mode of power among others working to generate and grow forces. The death grounding the sovereign right to kill now appears as the complimentary reverse of the social body's right to manage, ensure and develop life through biopower.[48] This transformation does not substitute or erase the sovereign power to make live and let die but comes to complete it, "penetrate it, permeate it, modify it, and which will be a right, or rather the exact inversion of this power: power to 'make' live and 'let' die." (IF 214/241*t*)

If the management and prolongation of life become the sole object and function of power, death comes to represent its very limit. It will thus be necessary to decrease mortality, extend life, stimulate the birthrate and optimize the conditions of life.[49] While sovereign power made use of death in its capacity to kill, in an era increasingly focused on making live and letting die,

> death, as the term of life, is evidently the term, limit, end to all power. It is on the exterior side, in relation to power; it is what falls outside its grip... death now becomes, in contrast, the moment when the individual escapes all power... Power no longer knows death. Strictly speaking, power forgets death [*le pouvoir laisse tomber la mort*]. (IF 221/248*t*)

In this sense, the mechanisms of biopower must be understood as operating in yet another counterpoint to the sovereign right and law (*droit*) to let live and make die. The power to make live and let die no longer deals with subjects of law under the threat of death, but with living beings, and must take charge of life itself to exert its mastery over them.[50] Biopower constitutes an increasing reference to what Foucault calls the *norm* with respect to the law, making use of the normativization of life to ensure its continual regularization and correction. Again, he writes, his intention is not to say that the normative absolutely supersedes the juridical institution of law but rather that law itself increasingly operates as a norm. The law in turn increasingly implicates itself into the primarily regulatory apparatuses of medicine, administration and so on. This comes to operate both at the level of individual bodies and at that of the population itself; power in this sense has taken control of life in general for Foucault.[51]

This passage from sovereign power to biopower also constitutes a certain shift in the role of warfare. Coinciding with a decrease in the use of the death penalty, wars after the 19th century are increasingly bloody precisely because the sovereign power over life and death comes to operate in a complementary manner to what Foucault calls State racism. Racism becomes what legitimates a putting to death within the normativity of biopower. While ancient and classical warfare had the function of ensuring the survival of the sovereign and in turn protecting the life of its individual subjects – the juridical power to kill in order to live – biopower takes as its object the biological survival of the population and the human as a living species. Genocide in this sense is not a return of the sovereign right to kill but rather the exercise of power at the level of life, species, race and population. Massacres thus become 'vital' in the management of the life and survival of the race.[52] Biopower permits the killing of those who constitute a biological threat, and racism operates to introduce a cut within the biological continuum of the human species between who must live and who must die. The sovereign injunction to kill one's enemies so that one may live now takes on a biological dimension no longer concerned with the survival of the individual; "the death of the other, the death of the bad race, of the inferior race (or the degenerate, or the abnormal) is something that will make life in general healthier: healthier and purer." (IF 228/255) The elimination of the danger to the purity of the race thus also passes through the sovereign power to kill, but also does so indirectly, by increasing the risk of death and disease for those perceived as threats.[53] The death of the other assuring the biological reinforcement of the self finds its culmination within Nazism, and I think one can read Nazism as the total dialectical overlap between making live and letting die. As Foucault puts it,

> [Nazism] is a society that has absolutely generalized biopower, but which has, at the same time, generalized the sovereign right to kill. The two mechanisms – the classical, archaic one that gave the State the right of life and death over its citizens, and the new mechanism organized around discipline and regulation, or in other words, the new mechanism of biopower – coincide exactly. We can therefore say this: the Nazi State makes the field of life it manages, protects, guarantees, and cultivates in biological terms absolutely coextensive with the sovereign right to kill anyone, meaning not only other people, but also its own people. (IF 232/260*t*)

§5.2.2: Rethinking Life and Death in Cuvier and Bichat.

In chapter 4, I'd shown with Derrida's reading of Heidegger that the Nazi biologization of life and the metaphysical thought of life responsible for the objectification of the earth and all its organic and inorganic matter came down to two effects of the same contradiction. It biopolitical

sovereignty culminates in the dialectical co-implication of sovereign power and biopower, making and letting live and die, one wonders how a thought of life's affirmative resistance still premised on a dialectics of activity and passivity could be sufficient to break with its mechanisms. However, I think something else is at stake in Foucault, since the shift from sovereign power to biopower coheres not only chronologically (from the classical to the modern period) but conceptually with other important reconceptualizations of life and death in biology and in medicine, which I will now explore in his discussions of Cuvier in *The Order of Things* and Bichat in *Birth of the Clinic*. In the 19th Century, life itself becomes the point of political resistance to the mechanisms of biopower.[54] But for life to not only become an object for power but also resist the powers attempting to control it, a total reconceptualization of its structure was needed. Foucault goes so far as to suggest that if biology as such did not exist in the classical age, it was because 'life' did not exist.[55] The classical continuum of natural beings becomes split in a radical discontinuity between the living and the non-living, organic and inorganic, living and dead: "the inorganic is the non-living, that which neither develops nor reproduces; it lies at the limits of life, the inert, the infertile – death. And although it is intermingled with life, it is so as that element within it that destroys and kills it" (MC 244/252*t*) Life and death are two powerful forces are at work in all living beings, one constantly operating in the destruction of the other. This differential play structures the living being in perpetual discontinuity with itself in the interplay between its inside and outside.[56] The living being maintains itself on the threshold of life and death, a death threatening it from without and within: "the animal [*la bête*] appears as the bearer of that death to which it is, at the same time, subjected; it contains a perpetual devouring of life by life. (MC 290/302) The same logic, I'll show, subtends Bichat's reconceptualization of death;

> the death which life, by definition, resists. Bichat relativized the concept of death, bringing it down from that absolute in which it appeared as an indivisible, decisive, irrecoverable event: he volatilized it, distributed it throughout life in the form of separate, partial, progressive deaths, deaths that are so slow in occurring that they extend even beyond death itself. (NC 203/144)

This will also come to characterize the refiguration of death and disease at stake in the biopolitical problematic: "no longer as a death that brutally cuts down life – as in an epidemic, but as that permanent death that slides into life, perpetually gnaws at it, diminishes and weakens

it." (IF 217/244*t*) How do these reconceptualizations play into the knowledge of and power over life?

In the last piece he wrote before his death, "Life, Experience, Science," Foucault distinguishes between two interpretive strains in French thought following the publication of Husserl's *Cartesian Meditations*. On the one hand, a philosophy of lived experience, the subject and '*le vécu*,' taken up by Sartre and Merleau-Ponty, having its roots in Bergson and Maine de Biran and finding its fullest expression in Sartre's *The Transcendence of the Ego*. On the other hand, a philosophy of knowledge, rationality and the Concept, taken up by Cavaillès, Bachelard and Canguilhem focusing on the foundations of formalism and intuitionism in Husserl's philosophy, with an eye towards the infinite task of universal reason.[57] As Lawlor puts it, the philosophy of lived experience attempts to make the transcendental immanent to lived experience; this is the phenomenological immanence that Deleuze and Guattari clearly distinguish from their own interpretation of immanence. In contrast to '*le vécu*,' '*le vivant*' maintains a hiatus between the empirical and the transcendental, one that exposes the human to its originary finitude, passivity and powerlessness before death, as well as before the infinite task of scientific and investigation. The reconceptualization of life and death in Cuvier and Bichat do not signify the triumph of vitalism over mechanism; the vitalist definition of the irreducible specificity of life is itself a surface effect of these reorganizations.[58] The shift from the classical to the modern *episteme* would in this sense constitute "the affirmation of an impossibility." (MC 259/267) In biology, this would be due to something within life that resists its physico-chemical explanation.[59] That life and death no longer offer themselves to representationalist thought in the modern era constitutes, as Foucault interestingly puts it, "this *double affirmation* – alternating or simultaneous – of being able and not being able to formalize the empirical." (MC 259/267-8*e*) Canguilhem's recognition of the inherent normativity of any scientific system and thus the constitutive failure of any science, culture or interpretation of reason's claim to universal validity consists of nothing less than the return of the enlightenment for Foucault; the dual recognition of the limits and possibilities of reason. Canguilhem's own research into the history of biology and medicine situates their internal normativity in an essential relation to the pathological; any knowledge of life must take into account the possibility of disease, death, monstrosity, anomaly and error. The knowledge of life thus finds itself in a paradoxical situation: the increasing precision within physico-chemical descriptions of life at the cellular and molecular level can

only elaborate itself alongside the death and disease that radically differentiate the organic from the inorganic.[60] This does not entail that vitalism is correct but that it constitutes the essential concept of the very history of biology, both at the theoretical-epistemological level and the moral-ethical level. On the one hand, there is the necessity of understanding the specificity of the living being without positing it as something otherwise to the physico-chemical and on the other, the moral requirement to avoid certain reductions, "namely, all those which tend to conceal the fact that sciences of life cannot do without a certain value assertion that emphasizes conservation, regulation, adaptation, reproduction, and so on." (DE4 773/474)

> The biologist recognizes himself in his very object of study
>
> since he lives and since he reveals, manipulates, and develops the nature of the living in an activity of knowledge that must be understood as 'a general method for the direct or indirect relieving of tensions between man and the environment.' The biologist has to grasp what makes life a specific object of knowledge and, thus, what accounts for the fact that among the living, and because they are living, there are beings capable of knowing, and of knowing, finally, life itself. (DE4 773/475)

At stake here is nothing less than the work of the Concept in life I covered in Derrida's reading of Canguilhem in *Life Death*, that by which the living being structures and is structured by its environment, but inflected quite differently. Foucault does not appear to see invisibility, error and impossibility as things the Concept can simply surmount but as more originary, ineradicable conditions. In this sense, I think living resistance can be understood beyond differantials of force, dialectics of making and letting, exposing biopolitical sovereignty to its own impossible Outside in the quasi-transcendental logic of the necessity and impossibility of any Concept fixing itself once and for all.

> Forming concepts is a way of living and not a way of killing life; it is a way to live in a relative mobility and not a way to immobilize life; it is to show, among those billions of living beings that inform their environment and inform themselves on the basis of it, an innovation that can be judged as one likes, tiny or substantial: a very special type of information. (DE4 774/475)

As I'll show in chapter 6, science and technology studies and translation both operate with error at the very heart of their processes of coding and decoding, as does life at its most elementary levels for Foucault. The human also inherits this originary possibility of error in its knowledge of life. If the human is the living being whose existence as living comes into question, I think this testifies more to an arch-ancient ex-propriation of the human, one Foucault finds in Nietzsche.

Glossing together the latter and Canguilhem, Foucault writes that truth would be the most recent error on the calendar of life; it is error that weaves the concepts of value and norm through the history of the relations between knowledge and life.[61]

It seems to me that this constitutive notion of error, the necessary and impossible knowledge of life offers another way to think the resistance of life to biopower in relation to its structural passivity, powerlessness and mortal finitude, one I'll show coheres entirely with the ring of Eternal Return binding together the two 'yes'es of double affirmation. In both *The Birth of the Clinic* and *The Order of Things*, Foucault distinguishes between the classical age of the 17th and 18th centuries and the modernity of the 19th century. The classical age is the age of representationalist thought: words and things cohere completely; the role of language is to transparently and neutrally represent the external world in terms of identities and differences; the task of philosophy, science and ontology is to construct a 'well-made language' having the naming of things as its fundamental task. I mentioned that for Foucault, biology and the notion of *life itself* did not exist at the time: natural history only concerns itself with *living beings*. Natural history exclusively privileges the visible; it ascribes names to things based on their visible properties. Its objects are the visible forms of lines, surfaces and reliefs and their measurements in quantity, distribution and relative size in number, figure and property. In this sense, every observation of the same living being will be identical and the naming of visible things beyond all uncertainty.[62] The same is true of the medical gaze in the classical age, operating in the fantasy of constant visibility: "the region where 'things' and 'words' have not yet been separated, and where – at the most fundamental level of language – seeing and saying are still one." (NC 8/xi) What Foucault calls the 'tableau' in biology and medicine stands as the ideal of an exhaustive descriptibility of the world, "the great myth of a pure Gaze that would be pure Language: a speaking eye." (NC 163/114) A translatability so total as to make translation itself superfluous.

The modern age by contrast constitutes a total reorganization of the field of the visible and invisible, life and death. Everything involved in situating the resistance of life to biopower needs to understand this passage between classical and modern thought not as a dialectical passage from the total translatability of a naive realism to the total untranslatability of a naive constructivism, but as something else. Certainly such an approach appears fecund for affirmative biopolitics; the death of God, truth and transcendent values clears the way for the creation and invention of new possibilities for life, new resistances to biopower, a creative concept of life

which can just as easily become the object of power (this is, more or less, Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche). Double affirmation, however, must seek an older, arch-ancient logic that makes these oppositions possible as it binds them to their absolute Outside, impossibility, finitude, powerlessness and death, just as it must engage otherwise this relation between the visible and the invisible. Cuvier introduces the privilege of anatomy over classification, the organism over its structure, the interior workings of the living being over its visible characteristics, all of which consist of nothing less than the discovery of life in biology.[63] Rupturing the continuum between words and things, life is no longer a characteristic of certain beings in the world, but gains its autonomy from the classical system of classification and nomination. Life is now what links the surface functioning of organs to their secret, interior workings. Classifying living beings becomes a question of relating the visible to the invisible. This passage to the depths of the living being dissociates the homologous relation between words and things. The links between the two become conditioned in a space beyond that of representation and the immediately visible in what Foucault calls a necessary but inaccessible nether-world structuring all knowledge of life.[64]

The same logic is at work in Bichat's reconceptualization of death. Medical experience turns itself towards the invisible and mysterious secrets located within the body.[65] The age of Bichat, as Foucault cites him, opens with the injunction "'open up a few corpses: you will dissipate at once the darkness that observation alone could not dissipate.' The living night is dissipated in the brightness of death." (NC 206/46) In both Cuvier and Bichat, what is at stake is less a total abandonment of classical systems and their absolute values than a mutation and reorganization of the relations between the visible and the invisible.[66] While the classical age understands death and disease as indistinguishable since both ultimately culminate in the termination of life, Bichat identifies two series of phenomena in death: "manifestations contemporary with the disease and those prior to death." (NC 198/141) Bichat, as I showed in Deleuze's *Foucault*, distinguishes between animal and vegetal or organic life in the same body, the latter persisting after the personal death of the individual organism: "long after the death of the individual, miniscule, partial deaths continue to dissociate the islets of life that still subsist." (NC 200/142).[67] Bichat thus locates a permeability between life and death, multiple and dispersed throughout the organism even after its death. It is that to which life *exposes* itself at every instant, but *opposes* until its very end. But ought one read this as the dialectical juxtaposition/opposition/positional logic in Derrida, in exposition; la vie *est* la mort, in

opposition, la vie *et* la mort, or does the unheard difference here not articulate itself from the possibility of a *la vie la mort*?[68] Again, therein lies the difference between affirmative biopolitics and the double affirmation of life. Foucault in fact seems to opt for the latter at times: "the irreducibility of the living to the mechanical or chemical is secondary only in relation to the fundamental link between life and death. Vitalism appears against the background of this 'mortalism.'" (NC 204/143)

§5.2.3: Transgression and the Outside

As I'd shown in Foucault's readings of Cuvier and Bichat, a necessary but unknowable structure of life and death conditions all ulterior oppositions between vitalism and mechanism. Recognizing this unknowability brings with it nothing less than the birth of the human for Foucault. It is in Kant that he first reads the apprehension of a transcendental field where the subject reveals itself as finite. What Foucault identifies as the quasi-transcendental Forms of Life, Work/Labour and Language are constitutively beyond representation, at the very exterior of our experience and come to entail what he calls the affirmation of an impossibility, the double affirmation of the necessity and impossibility of formalizing the empirical. It is in this dual structure of an epistemological-ontological-ethical obligation, an infinite task *and* its impossibility that finitude takes precedence over representational thought.[69] Ironically, the entry of the human into history is concomitant with the recognition of its own mortal finitude;

> man's finitude is heralded – and imperiously so – in the positivity of knowledge; we know that man is finite, as we know the anatomy of the brain, the mechanics of production costs, or the system of Indo-European conjugation; or rather, like a watermark running through all these solid, positive, and full forms, we perceive the finitude and limits they impose, we sense, as though on their blank reverse sides, all that they make impossible. (MC 324-5/342)

A finitude not only external and empirical but transcendental; "the death that anonymously gnaws at the daily existence of the living being is the same as that fundamental death on the basis of which my empirical life is given to me." (MC 326/343) To say these two deaths are the Same is irreducible to the classical logic of identity and difference; within this analytic of finitude, the human appears as "a strange empirico-transcendental doublet." (MC 329/347) This unthought underside and exterior older than the human is itself the Other; its double. As near as this double may be, it remains completely alien, and the task of thought – and ethics itself – becomes a

question of bringing it closer.[70] Ethics in modern thought "is advancing towards that region where man's Other must become the Same as himself." (MC 338/358)

This finitude of the human and the necessity and impossibility of ethics operates in the finitude of time itself. Nietzsche, he notes,

> took the end of time and transformed it into the death of God and the odyssey of the last man; he took up anthropological finitude once again, but in order to use it as a basis for the prodigious leap of the overman; he took up once again the great continuous chain of History, but in order to bend it round into the infinity of the eternal return." (MC 275/286)

The double promise-threat of Eternal Return – and with it the overman and the death of God – is certainly in this sense coextensive with the age of biopower, just as Lawlor terms modernity the age of the bio-will to power (or will to bio-power), but this reading only focuses on Heidegger's critique of Nietzsche, one Lawlor recognizes was held in high suspicion by Deleuze and Derrida. It seems to me that an-other thought of the resistance of life in its impossibility and finitude opens up in thinking together the Eternal Return, Blanchot's thought of the Outside, Bataille's transgression and double affirmation. What Nietzsche, Freud, Bataille and others realize for Foucault is that the human is originarily articulated upon things it can never master and do not have the same time as it. The task of thinking these consists in contesting their origin in order to found it, thus opening onto a thought of an origin without origin forcing us to rethink everything about time, exposing an a-chronological fault at its heart, its originary dimension of repetition and return.[71] In this difference where "the Other, the Distant, is also the Near and the Same," the task of modern thought announces itself as the unrealizable unveiling of the Same. (MC 350/370)

> Now, such an unveiling is not accomplished without the simultaneous appearance of the Double, and that hiatus, miniscule and yet invincible, which resides in the 'and' of retreat *and* return, of thought *and* the unthought, of the empirical *and* the transcendental, of what belongs to the order of positivity *and* what belongs to the order of foundations... is the distance creating a vacuum within the Same, it is this hiatus that disperses and regroups it at the two ends of itself. It is this profound spatiality that makes it possible for modern thought still to conceive of time – to know it as succession, to promise it to itself as fulfillment, origin, or return." (MC 351/370-1)

The promise and threat of Return as the end of man reappears in the final pages of *The Order of Things* where, with Bataille and Blanchot, Foucault begins to define something like an experience of the impossible. Experience, he writes,

> as experience of death (and in the element of death), of unthinkable thought (and in its inaccessible presence), of repetition (of original innocence, always there at the nearest and yet always the most distant limit of language); as experience of finitude (trapped in the opening and the constraint of this finitude). (MC 395/418-9)

Foucault's work on Bataille in "Preface to Transgression" and Blanchot in "The Thought of the Outside" will allow me to tie these threads together. Foucault writes of the passage to the Outside as one beyond discourse and representation, shattering and dispersing the subject as its opening to its pure exteriority. Again, Foucault finds traces of the experience of the outside in Nietzsche, Bataille's thought of the limit and transgression, Klossowski's thought of the double and Blanchot's notion of the Outside. Foucault notes the risk in any discourse reflecting on itself of returning the experience of the outside and the other to interiority, consciousness, the body and the will. What Foucault finds in Blanchot's usage of negation, as I showed in Derrida's discussions of the *pas* and the *without*, is precisely this pure Outside.[72] What I explored in chapter 1 concerning Blanchot and Bataille's thought of experience as an authority that expiates itself, questioning everything in an experience of the impossible is thought by Foucault as a 'non-positive affirmation,' a 'limit experience' in Blanchot's notion of contestation.

> Contestation does not imply a generalized negation, but an affirmation that affirms nothing, a radical break of transitivity. Rather than being a process of thought for denying existences or values, contestation is the act that carries them all to their limits and, from there, to the Limit where an ontological decision achieves its end; to contest is to proceed until one reaches the empty core where being achieves its limit and where the limit defines being. There, at the transgressed limit and where the limit defines being. There, at the transgressed limit, the 'yes' of contestation reverberates, leaving without echo the I-A of Nietzsche's donkey. (DE1 238/74-5*t*)

Although, of course, the mechanical repetition of the donkey's '*ja*' is itself thought in the ring of Eternal Return as the condition for anything to be affirmed or promised at all. I think this is how one can conceive of the affirmation of life as a resistance to biopower without immediately committing it to its mechanism in a differential of forces; a life death making all dialectical opposition of making live and die possible as it exceeds them, "not in showing the invisible, but in showing the extent to which the invisibility of the visible is invisible." (DE4 524/153) This non-dialectical negation which is also a non-positive affirmation can be read in what Blanchot calls attraction; a synonym for Nietzsche's Force, Artaud's materiality and Bataille's transgression for Foucault as "the pure, most naked, experience of the outside." (DE1 525/154) Transgression is inseparable from a thought of the limit, just as attraction is inseparable from

neglect, a *fort-da* or *pas au-delà* opening onto its absolute Outside. "How could attraction not be essentially negligent – *letting things be what they are, letting time pass and return, letting people advance towards it*? For it is the infinite outside, for nothing falls outside of it, for it undoes every figure of interiority in pure dispersion." (DE1 528/156*t,e*) One can read here Eternal Return, a letting beings be anterior to any opposition making-letting-live-die as the law of the transgression of the *pas*, all the movements in *trans* (-cendence, lation, etc) I approached *à pas de colombe* in these chapters. Transgression is neither negative nor positive; it affirms both the limit and its unlimited transgression. "Perhaps it is simply an affirmation of division [*partage*]; but only insofar as division is not understood to mean a cutting gesture, or the establishment of a separation or the measuring of a distance, only retaining that in it which may designate the being of difference." (DE1 238/74)

A double affirmation then; "the empty outside of attraction is perhaps identical to the nearby outside of the double." (DE1 534/163) To hesitate a step into my next chapter, I imagine here a translation with no attempt to master time, a listening to and awaiting the promise of life-death on earth, a language that "is only a formless rumbling, a streaming; its power resides in dissimulation. That is why it is one with the erosion of time; it is depthless forgetting and the transparent emptiness of waiting." (DE1 538/167) An awaiting, a messianism without messianism issued from a past that has never been present which is also paradoxically its relation to a future, without force or power: the promise-threat of the Outside in the indefinite oscillation between origin and death.

> They immediately flip sides; the origin takes on the transparency of the endless; death opens interminably onto the repetition of the beginning. And what language *is* (not what it means, not the form in which it says what it means), what language is in its being, is that softest of voices, that nearly imperceptible retreat, that weakness deep inside and surrounding every thing and every face – what bathes the belated effort of the origin and the dawnlike erosion of death in the same neutral light, at once day and night. (DE1 539/168)

§5.3: Hardt, Negri and Affirmative Biopolitics

§5.3.1: The Plane of Immanence and Dominion over the Earth

Before turning to Hardt and Negri's affirmative biopolitics and its ecological implications, let me note that Foucault posits biopower as indispensible to the development of capitalism.[73] Capitalism requires the growth of both population phenomena and economic processes, and

biopower assures the docility and usability of life in general to these ends.[74] In *The Order of Things,* Foucault traces a similar path to that between natural history and biology to that between 'the study of riches' and political economy. It is in the notion of production in work or labour that Foucault finds something in modern thought irreducible to representationalist exchange-value in the classical era. In the study of riches, the earth provides more than is needed by those cultivating it, and wealth corresponds to what is not immediately consumed, and thereby entered into circulation and exchange.[75] Ricardo, playing an analogous role to Cuvier, inverts this logic: "the apparent generosity of the earth is due, in fact, to its growing avarice; what is primary is not need and the representation of need in men's minds, it is merely a fundamental insufficiency." (MC 268/279) As the human population increases, available resources decrease and the birth of labour thus develops under the threat of death. Consequently, humans must increasingly exploit natural resources to sustain their growing population.[76] Political economy develops alongside the very finitude of man. In this situation of originary lack, "man risks his life. It is no longer in the interplay of representation that economics finds its principle, but near that perilous region where life is in confrontation with death." (MC 269/280) *Homo oeconomicus* is the human who spends its life avoiding death, and labour the means through which it triumphs over death by overcoming the insufficiency of nature. The more the human proceeds in its possession and domination of nature, the more it recognizes its own finitude and mortality.[77] Labour in modernity is thus intimately bound with an increasing exploitation of the earth's resources, and my study of Hardt and Negri's concepts of affirmation and the plane of immanence – through very different readings of Deleuze than those I proposed in chapter 4 – ought bear this in mind.

To better understand the role of affirmation in Hardt and Negri's biopolitics, it is important to note Hardt's deep familiarity with Deleuze.[78] In the foreword to the English translation of Deleuze's *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, Hardt presents Deleuze's concept of affirmation in contrast to the dialectical work of double negation destroying and sublating all differences. Similarly to what Derrida calls 'the phoenix motif' of the dialectic in *Life Death*, Hardt writes of dialectical negation in terms of resurrection, something that preserves and maintains what it negates in order to survive it. Non-dialectical negation is more simple and absolute, clearing an immanent and materialist ground for Nietzschean transvaluation and creation.[79] Negation plays a fundamentally different role with respect to affirmation in Nietzsche's masters and slaves. The slave's negation is purely reactive, requiring a double

negation to bring it to an affirmation. Conversely, negation is merely secondary to the master's pure affirmation. At stake here are two radically different conceptions of power: "on the one side, there is power separated from what it can do, Hegelian reflection... or Spinoza's *potestas*, on the other side, there is power internal to its manifestation... Spinoza's *potentia*." (HD 42) For the slave, power is transcendent and exterior to the field of forces. The slave's understanding of power is also manifest in its relation to death, a death it negates in order to reactively affirm life in its resurrection. For Hardt however, "when we pose death in general as the condition of life in general, we are dealing in terms too imprecise and too abstract to arrive at the singularity and concreteness of the difference that defines real life and subjectivity." (HD 39) The difference between dialectical and non-dialectical affirmation can be summarized as follows: "Hegel discovers a force reflected back into itself (self-consciousness or interiority), and Nietzsche proposes a force that emerges unhaltingly outside itself (the will to power or exteriority)." (HD 42) However, it is important not to misread the concept of exteriority here; the force constantly emerging outside itself rather signals the ground for the creative possibilities of life on the plane or field of immanence.[80]

Hardt is in no way inattentive to double affirmation and Eternal Return, but reads these Nietzschean concepts through a Spinozist lens.[81] The Nietzschean affirmation of being becomes an ethics of active expression to be taken up in a Spinozist practice of joy in the construction of a positive, creative society. Affirmation is not acquiescence but an act of creation, bound up with Deleuze's Eternal Return as *selective*.[82] In this non-dialectical active affirmation, the collapse of transcendent values clears the ground for the creation and invention of new possibilities of life, carrying forth a strain in philosophy running through Duns Scotus, Spinoza, Nietzsche and Deleuze culminating in the Will to Power as love and the production of common subjectivities.[83]

It is in thinking this alternative strain that one can better understand the splitting in Hardt and Negri's concept of modernity, crucial to their understanding of biopower and biopolitical resistance. In an earlier work, *The Labour of Dionysus*, recalling that Dionysus is the God of affirmation, foregrounding an alternative terrain of critique and living labour, the authors suggest that materialism ought not be confused with modernity but rather thought as an alternative within it, a freedom of labour subjugated by capitalist modernity. This materialist *vis viva* [living force] was never extinguished. Modernity contradictorily develops between this materialist current of productive forces and the capitalist power attempting to dominate them, the *potentia* (power) of

the multitude versus the *potestas* (Power with a capital P) of the state.[84] While modernity attempts to dialectically subsume its resistance, the non-dialectical negation Hardt reads in Nietzsche and Deleuze clears a space for a total transvaluation, an affirmation of the immanent powers of this world. Between 1200 and 1600, the primary event of modernity occurs in what they call the discovery of the revolutionary plane of immanence; "the affirmation of the powers of *this* world." (HNE 71) With Francis Bacon, Galileo and others,

> knowledge shifted from the transcendent plane to the immanent, and consequently, that human knowledge became a doing, a practice of transforming nature, ... the powers of creation that had previously been consigned exclusively to the heavens are now brought down to earth. This is the discovery of the fullness of the plane of immanence. (HNE 72-3)

It is in Spinoza that the authors see the plane of immanence and democratic politics completely coincide as the new truth of humanity.[85] As I showed in Deleuze, Spinoza's practice of joy directs itself against the sad passions, affirms the desire of life against the fear of death. Spinoza's philosophy of immanence, Hardt and Negri write, "transform[s] the world into a territory of practice, and affirm[s] the democracy of the multitude as the absolute form of politics." (HNE 77) Death, in this philosophy, is the weapon wielded by state powers to quell this desire for freedom.[86] Spinoza, on the other hand, bans death from his philosophy. As they cite him "a free man thinks about nothing less than of death, and his knowledge is a meditation on life, not on death." (HNE 78) For the authors, the affirmation of the immanent powers of social life is the only possible terrain for democracy. Democracy is the affirmation of the natural right of the multitude, of singularities acting in common, a matter of organizing encounters, maximizing joyful ones, the generative power of the multitude against the sad passions, the fear of death, transcendent rules, laws and norms. Spinozist democracy brings forth an absolutely immanent government. While Heidegger and even Nietzsche were correct to foresee the end of metaphysics in the crisis of modernity, Hardt and Negri argue, their incapacity to read modernity as the unfolding of these conflicting currents leaves them unable to posit any alternative.[87] However, I think this uncritical affirmation of the plane of immanence in transforming nature is not only problematic for environmental philosophy; it seems to me the Nietzsche critiqued by Heidegger and the biopolitics outlined by Hardt and Negri are not far from one another.[88] The completion of immanence in this sense may much less think an Outside to biopower than serve to reinforce its mechanisms.

§5.3.2: Biopower and Biopolitical Resistance

Hardt and Negri, however, maintain a certain distance from Foucault's division between sovereignty and biopower, drawing rather from Deleuze's "Postscript on Control Societies."[89] Societies of control operate in the total reduction of any distance between the apparatuses of control and social production. Rather than the economy of discipline coursing through society, the governmentality of biopower ought to be thought as "a passage *within* the notion of sovereignty, as a transition to a new form of transcendence. Modernity replaced the traditional transcendence of command with the transcendence of the ordering function." (HNE 88) As the disciplinary apparatuses come to identify themselves with the very biological dimension of social reproduction, the birth of biopower constitutes the realization of modern sovereignty, or *Empire*. Empire is the paradigmatic form of biopower since it attempts to rule over human interactions, human nature and social life in its entirety. But Empire is itself sustained by the creative forces of the multitude it attempts to suppress, which are also capable of constructing a counter-empire. Against the sovereign rule of the classical age and its transcendent power over life and death, the transcendent organizing function of biopower becomes more and more immanent to its subjects.[90] Hardt and Negri thus distinguish between biopower and biopolitics: while biopower regulates the production and reproduction of life itself from within, biopolitics "presents power with an alternative, not only between obedience and disobedience, or between formal political participation and refusal, but also along the entire range of life and death, wealth and poverty, production and social reproduction, and so forth."[91] (HNE 26) Governmentality develops the plane of immanence as the terrain of biopolitics. "There is no 'outside,' *dehors*; the *bios* is that 'inside' wherein each one is entirely enveloped." (NOB 55)

One of the more troubling aspects of Hardt and Negri's account of Empire and affirmative biopolitics more generally might be identified in their assertion that Empire is good *in itself* (if not for itself), a step forward, better than the sovereign transcendence preceding it. This is central to understanding their emphases on alternatives *within* Empire; "we should be done once and for all with the search for an Outside, a standpoint that imagines a purity for our politics."[92] (HNE 46) Imperial power is absolute because it is completely immanent to the biopolitical machine of social production and reproduction.[93] Modernity is torn between a constituted juridical power and the creative, immanent production of subjectivities. As such, they argue, when certain thinkers criticize modernity, they are really only attacking the first tradition,

that of a sovereign, transcendent biopower over and against the biopolitical affirmation of hybridities and differences. However,

> Empire too is bent on doing away with these modern forms of sovereignty and on setting differences to play across boundaries... The danger is that postmodernist theories focus their attention so resolutely on the old forms of power they are running from, with their heads tuned backward, that they tumble unwittingly into the welcoming arms of the new power. (HNE 142)

A danger from which their own project is not immune, as they certainly recognize. Because Empire depends on and is nothing other than the forces it attempts to control, particularly with respect to ecological destruction, I'd argue, Empire at its pinnacle

> represent[s] the continuous possibility of the destruction of life itself. This is an operation of absolute violence, a new metaphysical horizon, which completely changes the conception whereby the sovereign state had a monopoly of legitimate physical force.... Empire is defined here in the final instance as the 'non-place' of life, or, in other words, as the absolute capacity for destruction. Empire is the ultimate form of biopower insofar as it is the absolute inversion of the power of life.[94] (HNE 345-6)

Does this absolute inversion not then risk the violence and radical killing Heidegger reads in Nietzsche? As Hardt explains, the distinction between two types of power, *potentia* and *potestas*, is at the heart of Negri's work on Spinoza.[95] In *The Labour of Dionysus*, the two develop the notion of the *potentia* of the multitude against the *potestas* of the state in what they call a practical critique of violence, but might be better expressed as a critique of non-violence. One must not confuse a rejection of violence with a wholesale rejection of power, they caution. The discourse of nonviolence seeks a purity from and an outside to a violence always inherently correlated to injustice, but culminates in a reactive account of life and an ascetic ideal that negates life. Against this, Hardt and Negri invoke what they call the materialist tradition in understanding power as a form of violence.[96] For Spinoza and Nietzsche, "life itself involves violence and it would make no sense to pose any notion of the right, the just, or the good outside the context of the exertion of power." (HNL 292) As they interpret him, Foucault is precisely not seeking an outside to power, a society without power relations, which would come down to anarchism.[97] Borrowing Foucault's notion of 'anarchaeology,' they attempt to differentiate between types of violence rather than positing it as wholly acceptable or inacceptable.[98] Again, the authors read the multitude as itself always already an imposition of power. Affirmative biopolitics, I'd say, consists in "affirming one type of power over another, the constituent power

of the multitude against the constituted power of the State." (HNL 307) The resistance to biopower rests on nothing outside it; the search for alternatives within Empire is precisely positioned against an outside to power. Liberation "*must be achieved within this world, on the plane of immanence, with no possibility of any even utopian outside*." (HNE 65) Spinoza's account of the multitude with its affirmation of the creative capacities of desiring bodies constitutes the only possible resistance to biopower.

> What is central... in the general concept of Empire, is that a terrain of immanence be affirmed. Immanence is defined as the absence of every external limit from the trajectories of the action of the multitude, and immanence is tied only, in its affirmations and destructions, to regimes of possibility that constitute its formation and development. (HNE 373)

The affirmation of this immanent desire and productivity is what the authors call generation; "the *primum* of the biopolitical world of Empire." (HNE 389) Empire "pretends to be the master of the world because it can destroy it. What a terrible illusion! In reality we are masters of the world because our desire and our labour regenerates it continuously." (HNE 388) Biopolitical generation is an originary process that allows biopower to regenerate itself, and affirmative biopolitics affirms this 'first' dimension.[99] "If power (*pouvoir*) presents itself as a *dispositif* of total and full constitutiveness, if the ontological condition is power (*puissance*), then the political is configured not so much as resistance but as *generation*, no longer as 'being against' but as 'being for.'" (NOB 60) In this sense, we have reached the end of the politics of Platonic transcendence for Negri.[100]

What then are the overlaps with the affirmation of generation and this new concept of resistance? Drawing again from Deleuze and Guattari, the authors open *Empire* with the claim that "resistances are no longer marginal but active in the centre of a society that opens up in networks; the individual points are singularized in a thousand plateaus." (HNE 25) Resistance, as they follow Deleuze's interpretation of Foucault, is in a sense prior to power. In their chapter "De Corpore I: Biopolitics as Event," Hardt and Negri return to Foucault in developing resistance as "an other to power (or even an other power)." (HNC 56) However, the authors hesitate to use Marx's notion of 'counterpower' to define resistance, since resistance is not homologous to power. The other power is a production of subjectivity that resists and seeks autonomy from power.[101] Here the authors recall their distinction between biopower and the biopolitical resistance of life: "the biopower against which we struggle is not comparable in

nature or form to the power of life by which we defend and seek our freedom." (HNC 57) The political expression of freedom on the plane of immanence, Negri adds, is itself *without power*.[102] Biopower is understood as a power *over* life, and biopolitics a power *of* life in its resistance to biopower and its alternative production of subjectivities.

However, whatever may be suggested in their passage between *another to power* and *another power* seems to skew entirely in favour of the latter in their readings of Heidegger and Derrida. Hardt and Negri open *Commonwealth* with a critique of what they perceive as 'apocalyptic' discourses in discussions of biopolitics and their exclusive focus on the concept of sovereignty, the rule of exception and its transcendent, even theological power, such accounts foreclosing a political engagement with power. By contrast, their project intends to overcome the powerlessness entailed by transcendent forms of power with the affirmation of the immanent powers of the multitude here on earth, in its active powers of resistance. Heidegger in particular is targeted for his alleged fixation on powerlessness and death.[103] Perhaps nowhere is the difference between Hardt and Negri's project and my own more clearly marked than when they suggest that "Heidegger's notion of *Gelassenheit*, letting go, withdrawing from engagement, for example, not only brings back the earlier vitalism and voluntarism by confusing history with destiny but also reconfigures them as an apology for fascism." (HNC 29) The difference between our two projects is further solidified when they take on Derrida (along with Agamben and Nancy). While these authors accept that biopolitics is ambiguous and conflictual, they see resistance "acting only at its most extreme limit, on the margins of a totalitarian form of power, *on the brink of impossibility... leav*[*ing*] *biopolitics powerless and without subjectivity*."[104] (HNC 57-8*e*) For Negri, deconstruction is not necessarily a return to transcendence (although he especially faults the Derrida of Levinasian inspiration). However, deconstruction's attempt to 'shake up' the fullness and density of the plane of immanence by emphasizing the marginal, excessive, disseminative and the '*partage*' seeks to reintroduce the value of judgement in politics. However, in thinking the plane of immanence as a fold, bound with tensions and events,

> it is no longer necessary to define a disseminating margin and, from there, construe a development of value: instead, it is the centre of this being that is expressive, not through deconstruction but through the constitution of a power, *puissance*, in the constant sequence of the folds and (tenuous yet strong) movements of being. (NOB 59)

Perhaps, as I wrote above, the line between affirmative biopolitics and the resistance of double affirmation passes between creation and invention; active creation, the affirmative possibilities of

the immanent, creative possibilities of life, and what Derrida calls the invention of the other, the impossible experience of preparing a place to let the other, the event come, which can be correlated to the notions of awaiting I'd explored in Foucault and Derrida's messianic promise. As I've shown, Hardt and Negri do attempt to think a concept of resistance anterior to power and which does not get caught up in its structures.[105] But this resistance is correlated to what they call a biopolitical notion of the event, "different from the conception that events only come 'from the outside,'... those who follow this notion of the event can only wait with a kind of messianic fervour for another event to come." (HNC 178) It then seems that two radically different concepts of the event, corresponding to creation and invention, trace the articulation between affirmative biopolitics and a double affirmation of life beyond biopolitics. For Hardt and Negri, "biopolitical events instead reside in the creative acts of the production of the *common*. There is indeed something mysterious about the act of creation, but it is a miracle that wells up from within the multitude every day." (HNC 178) For Negri, however, this power *of* life must not be understood in terms of 19th Century vitalism, which cannot think events or singularities. The roots of what he proposes as a 'poststructuralist vitalism' lie in Machiavelli, Spinoza, Nietzsche and Marx. Vitalism is a philosophy of *power* (*puissance*, *potentia*), the flow of which is structured by events and singularities, and must be reinterpreted as an ontology of practice on the field of immanence and in the 'ecology of the commons.'[106] This latter notion is itself drawn from Hardt and Negri's work, and I permit myself a longer citation here.

> Whereas the traditional notion poses the common as a natural world outside of society, the biopolitical conception of the common permeates equally all spheres of life, referring not only to the earth, the air, the elements, or even plant and animal life, but also to the constitutive elements of human society, such as common languages, habits, gestures, affects, and so forth... We might call this an ecology of the commons – an ecology focused equally on nature and society, on humans and the nonhuman world in a dynamic of interdependence, care, and mutual transformation. (HNC 171)

§5.3.3: Immaterial Labour, the Machine Economy and the Ecology of the Commons

Hardt's reading of Nietzsche and Spinoza in terms of living labour can be found in his book on Deleuze. Against the transcendent, reactive, slave mentality of power, the worker recognizes its essence as a force, Will to Power, living labour and creation. The synthesis of Eternal Return courses through the mass of workers, a social synthesis, bringing all workers into a powerful and joyful assemblage in their working, willing and acting together.[107] After the collapse of transcendent values, the affirmation of life must constitute itself in the self-valorization of

productive labour, the practical production of bodies and affects. As a pure 'power to act,' labour brings together the intelligence, passion and affect of the workers into a constituent, affirmative and immanent power. In this sense, Hardt and Negri argue that the Spinozist power to act is actually Nietzschean, concerned with the destruction of transcendent values and the immanent creation of new ones.[108] The authors emphasize the increasingly immaterial, intellectual, affective and techno-scientific dimensions of labour; "the labour of the cyborg." (HNL 9) A hybrid of machine and organism, labour comes to stand as the expressive production of the ecology of the commons. As they suggest, the biopolitical production of subjectivities must be understood as an ecological struggle that came to express itself in immaterial labour.[109] Against the idea that capital would pursue its accumulation of the non-capitalist environment: humans, animals, vegetal and mineral until nothing is left, leading to its starvation, capital "subsumes not the non-capitalist environment but its own capitalist horizon – that is, the subsumption is no longer *formal* but *real*. Capital no longer looks outside but rather inside its own domain." (HNE 272) Capital's real response to the threat of ecological disaster takes place after "mechanical and industrial technologies have expanded to invest the entire world... Through the processes of modern technological transformation, all of nature has become capital, or at least has become subject to capital." (HNE 272)

Again, the affirmative biopolitics developed by Hardt and Negri are almost identical to the total bio-technological enframing and objectification of the earth in which Heidegger sees Nietzsche's thought culminating. As the authors add in a footnote, however, "we do not mean to suggest that capital can perpetually through technological advances reconcile its destructive relationship with its (human and nonhuman) environment. What technological advances can do is shift the terrain of conflict and defer the crisis, but limits and antagonisms remain." (HNE 459n21) Biopolitical reason, they add elsewhere, would

> put rationality at the service of life, technique at the service of ecological needs, where by ecological we mean not simply the preservation of nature but the development and reproduction of 'social' relations... between humans and nonhumans, and the accumulation of wealth at the service of the commons. (HNC 125)

This notwithstanding, nowhere else could my hesitations before the ecological potential of an affirmative biopolitics be more clearly read. Indeed if, as they suggest, this cyborg, hybrid, posthuman nature of labour marks where deconstruction has lost its effectiveness, I instead suggest that it is precisely in interrupting the commons, in rethinking community as the ex-

propriation of the human that deconstruction offers the best way to think sharing a world with other living beings, having only in common the radical passivity and finitude in the experience of an impossible death. In fact, such steps beyond are precisely what Negri reproaches Derrida in a response to *Spectres of Marx*. For Negri, Derrida's concept of spectrality perfectly captures the new immaterial nature of labour. Deconstruction, however, remains caught in a work of mourning; "at this crucial point, deconstruction refers back to a radical questioning of the problem of life and death, the opening of an experience of ethics and community." (NSS 9) Ethical resistance unravels in its discussions of the gift, friendship, justice, negative theology, 'the inaccessible to man,' 'the infinitely other,' Blanchot and the "paradoxical Nietzscheanism of Bataille." (NSS 13) As Negri asks, "how can protest be effective in a world of ghosts? How can ethical resistance become real?" (NSS 13) Since the spectral nature of labour entails that there is no longer an outside, one should denounce deconstruction's concept of practice, and shift from passivity to potential towards a new post-deconstructive ontology, a new power "where performativity comes to life in practice." (NSS 14) Such radically different understandings of performativity and the event are at stake between Hardt and Negri's biopolitics and what I'm attempting with a double affirmation beyond biopolitics that a debate seems moot. Unless, that is, affirmative biopolitics is to rethink life and death, community, the gift, justice, Blanchot and Bataille – but also in conversation with Nietzsche, Heidegger, Deleuze and Derrida. A turn to the work of Roberto Esposito, who does precisely this, is thus essential here.

§5.4: Esposito: Step/nots beyond an Ecology of the Commons

§5.4.1: Inverting Biopolitical Sovereignty, Inverting Affirmative Biopolitics

Esposito's work takes some important distances from Hardt and Negri's affirmative biopolitics with this question: "if life is stronger than the power that besieges it, if its resistance doesn't allow it to bow to the pressure of power, then how do we account for the outcome obtained in modernity of the mass production of death?" (EB 39) At stake here is again a passage between the sovereign power to make die and let live and the biopower to make live and let die, both of which Esposito sees as occurring in what he calls modernity. If sovereign power has its roots in Hobbes' sovereign ensuring the *preservation* of life, why do Nazi thanatopolitics turn this politics of life into the work of death? Esposito identifies two possibilities depending on how one interprets the relation between sovereignty and biopower. If the two are seen as radically

discontinuous, biopolitics is "absolutely euphoric," as in Hardt and Negri's affirmative biopolitics. (EB 8) On the other hand, if biopower and sovereign power are entirely *continuous*, one is "forced to assume genocide as the constitutive paradigm (or at least the inevitable outcome) of the entire parabola of modernity." (EB 43) Such an argument would be more in line with the thanatopolitics developed by Agamben and the necropolitics of Mbembe (and, for the most part, my own). The continuist hypothesis projects an absolute power over life, while the discontinuist affirms an absolute power of life.

I showed that for Foucault, Nazism constitutes the total overlap of sovereign power and biopower. Nazism for Esposito operates in what he calls an absolute normativization of life collapsing any distinction or mediation between the subject or person and its biological body. The immediate biological given is the absolute truth for Nazism, and this total coincidence of the body with itself forecloses the possibility of any transcendence.[110] Nazism excludes any mediation between life and politics, resulting in the terrible conclusion that life can be immunized, protected and strengthened through the growing production of death. As he explains in *Bios*, "more than a reduction of *bios* to *zoe* or to 'bare life' (which the Nazis always opposed to the fullness of 'life' understood in a spiritual sense as well), we need to speak of the spiritualization of *zoe* and the biologization of the spirit," – race, in a word. (EB 142) Both the biological and juridical norms of life become "completely superimposed according to the double negation of the biologization of the *nomos* and simultaneously the juridicalization of *bios*." (EB 138) Biopolitical sovereignty can thus be understood *both* as the metaphysical spiritualization *and* biologization of life and race I showed in Derrida's reading of Heidegger.

Esposito proposes what he calls immunization to think the articulation between sovereignty and biopower to see why a politics invested in protecting life reverses itself into a work of death. It is in thinking immunization otherwise than as the deadly negation of life that Esposito attempts to reverse its thanatopolitical drift culminating in Nazism into an 'affirmative biopolitics.' Both the sovereign right to kill and Nazi thanatopolitics can be read through immunization, and while biopower certainly grows out of older political categories, it is only by linking it to the negative protection of life in immunization that it emerges as a specifically modern category. "Only modernity makes of individual self-preservation the presupposition of all other political categories, from sovereignty to liberty." (EB 9) Modernity has its roots in Hobbes and the sovereign right of life and death in the *conservatio vitae* and the *conatus sese*

praeservendi, and while Nazism's absolute conjunction of the biological and the political continues to allow death to function in the preservation of life, "it will be produced in growing quantities according to a thanatopolitical dialectic that is bound to the condition of strengthening life vis-à-vis the ever more excessive realization of death." (EB 9)

Esposito's notion of immunization must be approached with reference to what he calls its true antonym, *communitas*, since the tensions between the two organize the entirety of modern politics for him.[111] The common in *communitas* is ontologically opposed to the proper and private: it is public, collective. However, it is the term '*munus*' to which Esposito turns his attention. *Munus* is traceable to the ideas of obligation, duty and also the gift: a gift that one both *must* and *cannot* give.[112] *Communitas* is founded on a pledge to give what one does not have or possess; a quasi-transcendental lack thus structures all community.[113] The *cum* of *communitas* signals an ex-propriation and an impropriety anterior to any will or subject as "the originary *munus* from which they arise as an uninterrupted expropriation." (ECI xxix) *Communitas* ought not be thought of as a subject writ large, intersubjectivity, a relation between alter egos, others or even an ecology of the commons, I'd add; community is an originary condition of relationality, but also its *partage*, *condivisone*, both what binds and interrupts relationality.[114] By contrast, the category of modern immunization can be understood as an immunity from the obligation of communal gift giving. The modern individual is 'absolute' in that it is absolved from this relation and the debt that binds it to others. Contagion from others becomes what threatens the identity of the modern individual, and immunization arises in the face of "the potential risk of a world given in common – and for this reason exposed to an unlimited indistinction."[115] (EB 66)

Hobbes had fully developed immunitary logic for Esposito. Humans share a generalized capacity to be killed, and since life's natural impulses towards acquiring everything makes any autonomous self-preservation impossible, life requires a transcendental source by which it negates itself in the interest of its self-protection. This transcendental condition has the same end as natural self-preservation but operates in an opposite fashion, by negating life. Sovereignty thus institutes the modern notion of the subject, the proper *subiectum* of representation and rights. Drawing from Locke, the human has a property over his person, and all other 'inferior creatures' on earth are given in common to humans. Hobbes' Leviathan places the *conservatio vitae* at its heart, and sovereign immunization thus circumscribes the entire horizon of biopolitics

for Esposito.[116] The Leviathan State arises out of the fear of death; it immunizes itself from the communal risk of death and an earth given in common.

Immunization can be thought of both as a biological and juridical protective response to the risk of contamination and contagion, overlapping biology, law, politics and communication. As Esposito recognizes, the threat of contamination is ineradicable in any individual or collective life. However, immunization protects life by negating it, or rather doubly negating life so that it may affirm it. In Nietzschean language, it is a reaction, repercussion and counterforce rather than an action. Immunization survives the threat of contagion by reproducing it within itself in a manageable quantity; it dialectically ensures survival by reappropriating a threat it thereby neutralizes.[117] Immunization separates life from its communal obligation – indeed from itself – in order to preserve and prolong it by deferring the death it interiorizes.[118] It thus corresponds more or less to what I've called restricted ecology throughout, and Esposito indeed confronts "the 'restricted economy' of a *conservatio vitae*" in his work on Bataille. (EC 18) However, he does not propose an absolute break from immunization and its dialectics between the protection and negation of life; such a break being no more possible than desirable. Immunity cannot be eliminated from community; "to negate the negation through which immunity in its turn negates what threatens life would be to repeat the same procedure." (EI 16) What is needed is rather a deconstruction of immunization so as to remove its negative character and affirm it as a *partage* within *communitas*.

Like Hardt and Negri, Esposito reads a certain doubling in modernity. Sovereign law is a right to life and death because it utilizes the threat of death in the interest of the preservation of life.[119] Nazi thanatopolitics, however, makes the norm of biological life the immediate object of politics. Not only is death now deployed to protect life, the strengthening of life is itself realized in the increased production of death in what Esposito calls a thanatopolitical dialectic. Immunization, the internal articulation between sovereign-modern power and thanatopolitics thus expresses the dialectical logic by which making and letting live and die, affirmative biopolitics and thanatopolitics constantly threaten to reverse into one another, along "the line that both *separates* and *unites* life and death." (EI 33-4) I'd shown the relation between la vie *et* la mort (separation) and la vie *est* la mort (unification) to themselves be dialectical effects of an originary dimension of life death, *la vie la mort*. A double affirmation beyond biopolitical sovereignty, a letting live-on must be dislodged therein in this deconstruction of immunization.

For Esposito, Nietzsche had entirely anticipated the immunitary paradigm in determining life as Will to Power.[120] As he recognizes, the ambiguous interpretability of Nietzsche's work itself mirrors this foresight, and anticipates both 20th Century thanatopolitics and affirmative biopolitics.[121] The reactive affirmation of life returns life to the death it flees, affirms only by negating and negating what it affirms.[122] Against the positive character given to immunization by the modern *conservatio*, Nietzsche reads the demand for self-protection as derivative from the Will to Power, thereby giving immunization a specifically negative emphasis. The *conatus* of 'consumptive Spinoza' signifies a life in distress while a healthy life seeks to expand its power even at the expense of its self-preservation.[123] The reason Nietzsche remains on the crest of nihilism for Heidegger is that the substitution of the Will to Power for the struggle for survival amounts to a negation of a negation, a mere inversion of Platonism. While this negation of immunization on its own would situate Nietzsche squarely within biopower, Nietzsche "simultaneously moves in two directions" for Esposito. (EB 99) I noted that Hardt and Negri's affirmative biopolitics can itself be read as representative of Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche. The non-dialectical negation of transcendent values reveals the immanent terrain for the creative possibilities of life and the techno-machinic enframing of the earth as a whole. *This* Nietzsche seems to propose an immanent, biopolitical Plato for a metaphysical Plato.[124] But what of the other Nietzsche, the other affirmation?

Foucault, Hardt, Negri and Esposito all seem to read the passage from sovereign power to biopower as one between the transcendent rule of law and the immanence of a norm. I've also shown that sovereign rule institutes the dispositif of the proper of the person or subject of representation as against an earth given in common. Nazi biopolitics eliminates any transcendence from the person, and crushes life into its bare biological referent. In fact, Esposito argues in *Third Person*, the failure of human rights after the Second World War happens not in spite of its emphasis on the person but because of it. Esposito recalls here Bichat's distinction between two kinds of life operating within the same body, the animal/rational and the vegetal/organic. If Nazism attempted to eradicate the animal/rational dimension of life, reducing it to its bare organic given, human rights inverts this relation, championing of the rational aspects of the person over its animal impulses. "Because of this shared assumption, contrary to first appearances perhaps, biopolitical corporealization of the person and spiritualistic personalization of the body are inscribed within the same theoretical circle." (E3 12) For Esposito, both develop

from the same Aristotelian definition of man as a rational animal, which Heidegger sees as mirror images of one another, as are the metaphysics and biologization of life.[125]

> Either there is a tendency for human life to be absorbed into animal life, as it was claimed in 19th century biophilosophy, along a course brought to its ultimate end by Nazism, or an symmetrical relationship is established between them that submits the animal part to the unconditional dominion of the other, on the basis of its preliminary character as rational or volitional. (E3 90)

This total convertibility is precisely why Derrida rejects any clear, single division between *bios* and *zoe* or any modern specificity to the biopolitical paradigm. I've shown that Heidegger's "Letter on Humanism" and his *Nietzsche* lectures constitute a confrontation not only with Nazi biologism but with the definition of man as *animale rationale* as insufficiently humanist, too biologistic and revealing that "the metaphysics of classical humanism, the metaphysics that is not humanistic enough is, deep down, the ally or accomplice of biologism and zoologism." (BS1 428/322) As Derrida elaborates,

> when Heidegger *on the one hand* condemns biologism (and clearly modern biologism), and *on the other hand* denounces as metaphysical and insufficiently questioning the zoologism of a definition of man as *zoon logon ekhon* or, a fortiori, as *zoon politikon*, he is going exactly in the direction of this whole supposedly new configuration that Agamben credits Foucault with having inaugurated. (BS1 431/324)

Derrida categorically rejects that the introduction of *zoe* or bare life into politics founds a modern biopolitics. Agamben's distinction cannot possibly admit that Aristotle had anticipated the 'modern' category of biopower.[126] For Derrida, this explains why Agamben gets stuck on Foucault's claim that the human is no longer an animal with the capacity for politics, but one whose politics call its biological existence into question.[127]

> The specific difference or the attribute of man's living, in his life as a living being, in his bare life, if you will, is to be political. Foucault's 'with the additional capacity' indeed echoes this..., seeming to oppose with an 'in question' two possibilities that I for my part find to be perfectly reciprocal or reciprocable or complementary. (BS1 438/330)

This is why, to return to Esposito, Nazi bio-thanatopolitics and the personalist biopolitics of liberal individualism are the mere reversal of one another; both remain bound to the same imperative: "to manage life productively: in the first case, to benefit the racial body of the chosen people; and in the second, to benefit the body of the individual subject who becomes its master." (E3 91) If the metaphysics and biologization of life, personalism and Nazism, sovereignty and

biopower all come down to the same logic, how is anything like an affirmative biopolitics possible or desirable?

For Esposito, both sovereign law and the biopolitical norm presuppose the *life* of the subject in Foucault, and "it is this structural homology that maintains the disciplinary norm in the immune circle of the law. (EI 142) However, Esposito sees in Canguilhem something that resists the dialectics welding together making and letting live and die. Canguilhem differs from Foucault by thinking the norm as intrinsic and immanent to the living being, removed from the transcendental condition of the law.[128] I've shown that for the former, the organism furnishes its own norm of life and that the abnormal is structurally anterior to the normal. As such, the norm of life must be understood in

> its tendency towards perpetual self-deconstruction. Since every norm can only establish itself through the infraction of, or deviation from, the one that precedes it, it follows that the organism that is most 'normal' is able to break and change its own norms more often. The norm for any organism, in short, is the ability to change its own norms. This means first that biological normativity coincides with normativity, or the power to create new norms, and second, that normativity, far from being reducible to a form of preventive or even subsequent normalization, is a measure of the vital force of existence." (EI 143)

Risk, exposure to possible contagion and contamination in the ecology of the commons are all functions of the healthy organism. It is the unhealthy one that negates itself in the immunitary dialectic of the *conatus sese praeservendi* and the *conservatio vitae*.

It is important to go slowly through Esposito's argument since this reference to a 'vital force of existence' seems contrary to much I've been developing. As this argument develops in reference to Canguilhem, Simondon, Deleuze and Spinoza in the final pages of *Bios*, it can certainly appear much closer to the affirmative biopolitics of Hardt and Negri. As I mentioned above, this is why Wolfe argues Esposito's conclusion in *Bios* ends up endorsing an unworkable egalitarian biocentrism long familiar to readers of environmental philosophy. Wolfe's points are of the utmost importance here, especially since he reads affirmative biopolitics as engaging only the first part of an aporia (I'd say the first part of an affirmation).[129] But much of Esposito's earlier work, especially in *Categories of the Impolitical* and *Communitas* outlines a way to think the form and norm of life together without having recourse to this dedifferentiating discourse of life. This is how I read Deleuze's accounts of Spinoza and Simondon in chapter 4 through the logic of the *pas au-delà,* the Outside and double affirmation. I'll now attempt to read this in Esposito to develop life as its structural differentiation and ex-appropriation, its interruption of

relationality in an ecology without symbiosis, a *partage*, a step/not beyond the ecology of the commons.

§5.4.2: Individuation, the Impersonal and the Impolitical

How ought one read in Esposito an impolitical underside to biopolitics? The impolitical traces the finite limits of the political, he writes, but its negation is paradoxically affirmative; it affirms that "there is no political but the political." (ECI xviii) The impolitical is thus not so much beyond the political as it is its impossibility, one preparing a space for the deconstruction of the political's categories. I'll attempt here to transpose this into the category of biopolitical immunization to imagine an affirmative resistance to its negation.[130] Esposito goes very far in theorizing the impolitical precisely as the radical passivity, powerlessness and finitude necessary to thinking a resistance to biopower. As he argues, there is nothing outside of power: power "encompasses the entirety of *represented* reality." (ECI 12*e*) Representation, I showed with Heidegger, can be said to be the political category that binds metaphysical humanism to biopolitical biologism. This fullness of power, however, "allows the nonpower of that which *is not* to show through; not from outside reality, but from behind it, as its reverse side... it is in this absence – the unexpressed, the unthought, the forgotten – that the impolitical gathers." (ECI 12) The *subiectum* of representation is inextricably bound to the political categories of power and possibility, and Esposito engages the powerless underside to this structure. Although he keeps the word power, he similarly to Hardt and Negri distinguishes *potere* from *potenza*, the latter a non-active power corresponding to passion, suffering and patience. The same applies to force; if force is everything, the non-force it is not still comes through.[131] The other to the force and power encompassing all that is possible, real and existing must be thought as otherwise than being; the impolitical "remain[s] external to its opposite without ever being anything other than it, in transcend*ing* [*trascendimento*] the thing whose opposition defines its nature."[132] (ECI 15) Following Bataille, this transcendence will come to express a community of the impossible, community as differentiation itself, an affirmation entailing the breakdown of all dialectical relations between activity and passivity, force and counterforce, power and counterpower, "political and impolitical, life and death, immanence and transcendence." (ECI 15) The impolitical is beyond the political but in a sense irreducible to a metaphysical understanding of transcendence; it is part of life itself. The political transcends itself toward its impolitical

underside, referring thought to an absence and invisibility beyond the play of representation subtending the metaphysics and biologization of life.

Let me develop this passive *potenza* further. In a chapter on Elias Canetti, Esposito argues that power and antipower come down to one another, and any alternative to the language of power is thereby impossible. Canetti presents this as the biological law of life's ineluctable relationship with death; we can no more turn away from life than we can from death, since we live off the deaths of other creatures.[133] As Esposito asks,

> how is it possible to live without death, if life nourishes itself on death? How is it possible to push all the death out of life, if life derives from the indisputable reality of death? This [is] *the* Canettian question. How can one live without doing so by surviving others [*vivere senza sopravvivere*]? How can we achieve the impossible 'squaring of the circle?' (ECI 113)

To square this circle would require living without growing and growing without eating. For Canetti, eating produces growth while growth produces life, and power thus produces the subject in a dialectic of power and antipower. One could develop this in conversation with Derrida's "Eating Well" [*Il faut bien manger*]. The structure of what Derrida calls carnophallogocentrism is the ineluctable condition of the subject: a subject of calculation, representation, sovereignty and power. The difficult syntax of its French title implies both a description: of course *one must* eat, and a normative prescription: one must eat *well*. But this is also why Derrida argues that vegetarians still eat the flesh of the other; the structure of carnivorous sacrifice belongs to the logic of subjectivity. But of course, as an experience of the impossible, deconstruction allows us to think this impossibility otherwise. Esposito develops this in the distinction between *potenza* and *potere*; *potere* is a limit, end and prohibition bound to consciousness and negation while *potenza* refers to a fluidity, heterogeneity and contingency bound to the body and affirmation. Power as *potere* is the absolute condition of the subject, its capacities and capabilities. However, the impolitical reversal of the category of subject reveals what he calls a *passive power* [*potenza*] correlated to passion, suffering and patience. Only active power, he argues, remains bound to the subject of power. To think potentiality as passivity is the only way to undermine power. It does not propose an alternative to power and will but rather withdraws from it, not by way of distraction but *attention*.[134] The similarity to Foucault's discussion of attraction and neglect in Blanchot's thought of the Outside are unmistakable. If doing and killing are inseparable and while, for Canetti, this thought itself may even kill, "it doesn't know that. It did not wish that. It

does not insist on surviving" but perhaps resists, protests gently, in favour of a *letting live-on*. (ECI 122)

Esposito comes to read this as a kind of *Gelassenheit*; not abandoning the world but annulling oneself within it. This opens onto a thought of the impersonal and non-action, an 'inactive action' beyond activity and the act.[135] This impersonal dimension, I've shown, is precisely a critique of the proper and the person, the very ex-appropriation of the human Derrida reads in the *Zusage* and *Gelassenheit*, (which are themselves so closely bound to double affirmation), and opens onto the underside of the biopolitical subject of rights, laws, norms and representation. Otherwise than the affirmative biopolitical notion of the creative possibilities of life, Esposito invokes a thought of *decreation*. "Decreation is a self-annulling creation, a creative self-annulling. More generally, it is also an act that does not express activity – or rather, it is an activity that is not completed in the 'act' but rather remains 'potential'... 'passive power'... decreation as *passive activity*." (ECI 133) To paraphrase a distinction discussed by Derrida, Benjamin and others, if rights, laws and norms belong to the order of the active, responsible human subject, then justice belongs to the impersonal, pre-subjective and the pre- or posthuman. Citing Simone Weil, "on this earth there is no force but force. That could serve as an axiom. As for the force which is not of this earth, contact with it cannot be bought at any lesser price than the passing through a kind of death." (ECI 154) This kind of death, he concludes, "is justice, which resembles death because it is not of this world." (ECI 154) One can see here the threads weaving together the Blanchotian neuter, the impersonal One dies, the interior-exterior doubling of death, the experience of the impossible and double affirmation in Deleuze and Derrida. It is indeed through a discussion of the pre-subjective transcendental field via Simondon that Esposito concludes *Bios*.

Esposito wishes to overturn the thanatopolitical drift of biopolitics from a power *over* life to a power *of* life, but a power that needs to be read in the context of the above discussion of passivity. He wishes to articulate the form and norm of life together in a norm that only survives in breaking with itself and a form that structures life as continually pushing beyond itself. This will consist in excising the categories of life, the body and birth from their thanatopolitical power to convert the immunitary negation of life into an affirmative biopolitics. In this sense, one can understand his 'vitalization of politics' more in the key of disclosing its impolitical underside, its impossibility. Esposito turns to Simondon in addressing the category of birth as the threshold

separating biopolitics from itself and pushing it beyond itself. He identifies two relevant points of entry into Simondon's system: a concept of being as becoming and an understanding of becoming as process of individuation.[136] One can read this logic in terms of double affirmation, on the one hand "the trans-individual explosion of the Dionysian," and on the other "the Apollonian principle of individuation." (EB 90) Every individuation is structurally incomplete, arising out of a pre-individual structure and itself constituting the grounds for further individuations.[137] The subject of will, representation and action is never separated from its presubjective 'living roots,' its organic materiality and ecological inscription. This entails that only a difference of degree passes through the human and other animals, fungi, vegetal and minerals. Psychic individuation always preserves a remainder of somatic individuation, and every individuation is itself another birth; "*to live is to perpetuate a birth that is permanent and relative*." (EB 181) Against the conservative fear of death structuring the *conservatio vitae*, life defers death by being continually reborn.[138] Affirmative biopolitics must attempt to think this 'form of life' in a relation of reciprocal immanence to its norm, "oppos[ing] the Nazi normativization of life with an attempt to vitalize the norm." (EB 184) It is in Spinoza's philosophy of natural right that Esposito reads the form and norm of life together, understanding life as always normalized and the norm as always already vitalized.[139]

Admittedly, Esposito's citing Spinoza's 'power to exist and act' of every living thing seems at odds with the powerlessness and impolitical passivity I just discussed. Certain resonances with Hardt and Negri's biopolitics can be traced here; a rejection of the modern transcendentalism that assigns rights and obligations to the subjects from without in favour of life's "unrestrainable power to exist," where Spinoza makes of the norm "the immanent rule that life gives itself in order to reach the maximum point of its expansion." (EB 186) Esposito, however, reads Spinoza's concept of natural right through the Simondonian notion of 'transindividuality' between individual and collective life.[140] On Esposito's reading, Spinoza reads the juridical norm as reproducing the individuating mutations of the biological norm.[141] This vitalization of the norm stands precisely against any attempt to absolutize it; the norm of life and its individuations in creation, science, literature and art are structurally metastable, logically posterior to the abnormal; it is the break with the norm that is originary. But this break, I'll show below, cannot be grasped in immanence; it is the auto-hetero-transcendence of the living on an epistemological-ontological-ethical scale. This brings me back full circle not only to Derrida's

discussion of Canguilhem in chapter 1 but Foucault's as well. For Canguilhem, Esposito writes, the living always exceeds the concepts and parameters through which it organizes life. "The logic of the living is capable of introducing a powerful semantic in the juridical norm against the immunitary normalization of life that is able to push beyond its usual definition." (EB 191) It is with Deleuze's "Immanence: A Life" that Esposito concludes *Bios*, an essay bringing together the pre-subjective transcendental field and Blanchot's impersonal death. The impersonal, as Esposito draws from Deleuze's *Logic of Sense*, is the flow of a single matter traversing humans, animals and plants beyond the limits of their individuations. But I'd also shown that it structures life in its double finitude, one also underlying what Foucault reads in Bichat.[142]

Let's recall that the impersonal, neuter and third person comes to designate the Outside itself in Deleuze, Blanchot and Foucault. As Esposito writes in *Third Person*, the impersonal exists at the limits of the personal as the site of resistance to immunitary negation.[143] The impersonal is an exteriority that traverses individual and collective life, both pre- and trans-individual. For both Deleuze and Foucault, the third person "passes via the outside – along that 'oceanic line' which skirts the abyss of death while resisting it." (E3 17) As I've shown, Foucault follows Bichat in grounding vitalism upon mortalism, as he follows Blanchot's double in thinking an Outside more exterior than any exteriority, more interior than any interiority.

> Life, one might say, is a biological structure that, for Foucault, is never coextensive with subjectivity because it is always caught in a dual, simultaneous process of subjection and subjectification: it is the space that power lays siege to without ever managing to occupy it fully, even generating continuously new forms of resistance. (E3 18)

In other words, life gives itself over to the split between thanatopolitical subjection, the power over life, and biopolitical subjectification, the resistance of life to this power. Here, "we can make out the still hazy outlines of an affirmative biopolitics." (E3 18)

§5.4.3: Par(t)ages, or Terra-che-si-ritira

It is in Deleuze's thought of immanence, however, a thought of life as "not that which resists death, arising out of this struggle, but rather that which separates death from itself, unfolding it in a continuous process of change," that Esposito pushes affirmative biopolitics more in line with my intentions here. (E3 18) On the plane of immanence, whatever may be called the subject is endowed with the ability to counteractualize events, to free them from any expectation or determination.[144] But let me recall from chapter 4 the *revenance* of Eternal Return permits

selection in an ethical thinking of the event; indeed structures what one inherits precisely as the injunction to let live-on otherwise. As in his discussion of Simondon, Esposito appears here to be leaning closer to the affirmative biopolitics of Hardt and Negri, affirming the creative possibilities and power of life against the transcendent norms of biopower. Furthermore, according to Esposito, Deleuze's emphasis on folding rather than exteriorization thinks immanence not, as Foucault does (again, for Esposito) "through the transcendence of transcendence or the externalization of the external... Immanence is nothing but the fold of being onto itself, its declension into becoming." (E3 18) But again, the relations between transcendence and immanence are perhaps infinitely complicated here. For Esposito, Levinas's emphasis on the transcendence of the person must be inverted onto the immanence of the impersonal, a reversal the latter allegedly cannot effectuate without sacrificing the absoluteness of the other. However, Esposito sees Blanchot as realizing the 'step beyond,' the *pas au-delà* that Levinas allegedly fails to take.[145] Citing Blanchot, "the greatest transcendence, the transcendence of transcendence, is finally immanence, or the perpetual referral of one to the other. Transcendence within immanence." (E3 130) Let's recall this beyond-within from my discussion of Derrida's *Adieu* in chapter 1, a transcendence in immanence older than their metaphysical opposition, but also how this notion intersects with the *pas au-delà*. How might we think this step/not beyond structuring any community and ecology?

As I noted above, Esposito believes that Nietzsche had completely anticipated the split between thanatopolitics and affirmative biopolitics. The Will to Power, let's recall, is posited in opposition to the *conservatio vitae* and the *conatus sese praeservendi*; life knows no other condition than its own preservation, strengthening and enhancement, which is also to say its exteriorization and alteration. For Esposito, this amounts to nothing less than a deconstructive account of life.[146] Life can be both a violent process of appropriation and overpowering as it can be, citing Nietzsche, "the feeling of fullness, of power that wants to overflow, the happiness associated with a high state of tension, the consciousness of a wealth that wants to make gifts and give way." (EB 88) Of the utmost importance in thinking the gift is this structural element of non-knowledge. As with Canguilhem, for whom the norm only exists in breaking with itself, Esposito's reading of Bataille will attempt to think community as this essential incompleteness and impossibility. For Esposito, Bataille breaks with Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche by proposing the latter less as a philosopher of the Will to Power than of the Eternal Return.[147]

Bataille, I'd shown, thinks the instant as the grounds a sovereign affirmation open as much to chance as to evil.[148] Esposito reads this as the impolitical underside of power reversing the restricted economy of the *conservatio*, reversing "the discourse of Completion in order to relaunch it and reorient it towards the future (or better, the possibility of its transcendence)." (ECI 184) As I also showed, this instant of the decision and the affirmation of life must be understood in the key of the *Zusage* or the passive decision here. The decision does not come from the Will to Power but from the opening of the instant in the Eternal Return.[149] This decision holds open the ring of return in its incompleteness, binds together the double affirmations of chance *and* necessity, instant *and* cycle. For Esposito, one must thus understand the decision as transcendence's laceration of the affirmation of the world of pure immanence. Transcendence is "the empty light against which the fullness of immanence appears in silhouette." (ECI 187) In this sense, Bataille puts transcendence to death as a metaphysical category,

> but what this really illuminates is that immanence must constantly transcend *itself*, internally. Immanence is constituted – not only surrounded – by the cut that separates it from what it is *not*, from its *own* difference from itself. Without this transcendence – which no longer refers to a super-essential substantive entity but precisely to that entity's death – immanence would be made absolute, and that would restore the metaphysical identity that the entirety of Bataille's thought aims to contest. (ECI 187)

The resistance to biopower lies not in the completion of immanence but precisely in its incompleteness, as the transcendence of a life death that holds the ring of Eternal Return open, binding together the restricted ecology of the *conservatio* to its absolute outside in the double bind of double affirmation. A transcendence that comes down to nothing less than the mortal finitude we share with all living beings in the experience of the impossible; an impossible community for Esposito, an impossible ecology for me. Life's transcendence in death, Esposito writes, opens onto a community *of* death.

> It is death that liberates the community from its immanence to itself; but in a way that is entirely unlike traditional transcendence (which requires an external higher being)... A community is the means by which that finitude can become constitutive of the beings who, in their difference, compose it. They compose a community not through a bond... but through an *alterity in common*, an alterity that is *shared*. As such, what is shared is not a presence, but an absence of being, in the sense that any lack can be empowered only by a lack in the other (the other *as* lack. (ECI 195)

Community is therefore impossible; it is structured not on sameness but the difference between its subjects, indeed in their difference from themselves. Death is the element of this binding non-

knowledge, interrupting any dialectic of recognition, since the death of the other is as unknowable and impossible as one's own death.[150] Community is rather the sharing of this impossible experience Esposito reads in the French '*partage*,' at once a cut, division, partition and sharing, what I've called the constitutive interruptibility of ecological relationality. Transcendence is precisely this cut: "not the opposite of immanence, but rather its interruption, or its exposure to its *own* 'outside.' It is the transcendence *of* immanence, not *from* immanence." (ECI xxviii) Esposito translates *partage* as '*condivisone*,' "a continuum that is taken out of the dialectical difference of subjective identity, returned to absolute difference (a difference that is no longer in the service of presence)." (ECI 164-5) Community is also opposed to any notion of intersubjectivity or dialectic of recognition since it shares and partitions out something utterly unknowable. The other in this sense "is the 'self's' transcendence of itself: not an external transcendence, but immanence's resistance to itself – *immanence's* transcendence. This interiorization of alterity is what makes intersubjectivity impossible, along with any notion whatsoever of recognition or representation." (ECI 196) It resists the logic of representation binding a metaphysics of the animal rationale to thanatopolitical biologism and with it the Heideggerian metaphysics of the proper and of authenticity. As a structurally constitutive expropriation, community partitions out an impossible, impersonal death.[151] Beyond the notions of making and letting live and die, Esposito says in Heideggerian terms that an inauthentic, anonymous and impersonal community allows one "to '*let the other be*' in its alterity *from itself*, which is to say, in its authentic inauthenticity, or most proper impropriety." (EC 97*e*) A letting beings be, a letting life live-on older than the opposition between transcendence and immanence, life and death, activity and passivity, the affirmation of living-on in its tra(nscenden)ce, res(is)tance and ex-appropriation, and the infinitely finite revenance of its différance.

It is only in this impolitical Outside, beyond or underside of biopolitics that a sharing the earth more justly in the face of having nothing in common becomes possible, in the *partages* in the *parages* of a structurally incomplete translation between two shores, in the absence of a world, *terre sans terre*, "a withdrawal from a land, a land that withdraws [*Terra-che-si-ritira*]." (EC 106)

> The sea withdraws, and in this withdrawal it is actualized not in two distinct passages but within one movement: it withdraws giving itself as a gift to others, and it gives itself as a gift as it withdraws. The sea's withdrawal leaves the land to be. Isn't this the very same

> figure of community, its originary *munus*, by which I mean what gives us a 'common name' only through the lack of 'our own name'?[152] (EC 108-9)

Esposito concludes, again with Nietzsche, that this impossible return is precisely the gift of the future, what I called the posthuman promise of the earth. The affirmation of community, beyond transcendence and immanence, frees the Eternal Return and the instant from the Will to Power.[153] This is how to understand the *pas au-delà* of double affirmation, "this 'beyond' refers not to whatever lies past its outer borders, but rather the penetration by these borders of its internal void, opening the impolitical to a sovereign *affirmation*." (ECI 197) But the sovereignty of this affirmation, the decision of the sovereign instant, all of these are to be understood in the radical passivity of a letting live-on, without force, without sovereignty, as Esposito cites Blanchot, a non-power that is not the simple negation of power, but excessively affirms more than can be affirmed, affirms affirmation itself.[154]

Can one, other than by way of metaphor, condemn to death a language (languages are killed, in a thousand ways, I have no doubt on that score and there are hundreds of languages that have disappeared in colonial or commercial, capital, techno-capitalist capitalist [*sic*] violence in recent years).

Jacques Derrida. *The Death Penalty Volume I*, 42/252.

The fact that languages appear strictly uncountable does not prevent them all from disappearing. In this century they are sinking each day by the hundreds, and this perdition opens the question of another rescue, or another salvation. How do we save a language, a language that is alive and 'intact,' by doing something other than archiving idioms (which we sometimes do scientifically, if not sufficiently, in a matter of urgency that is becoming more and more pressing)?

Jacques Derrida, *Monolingualism of the Other*, 55-6/30.

To translate humanity back into nature; to gain control of the many vain and fanciful interpretations and incidental meanings that have been scribbled and drawn over that eternal basic text of *homo natura* so far; to make sure that, from now on, the human being will stand before the human being, just as he already stands before the *rest* of nature today, hardened by the disciplines of science... This may be a strange and insane task, but it is a *task* – who would deny it! Why do we choose it, this insane task? Or to ask it differently: 'Why knowledge at all?' – Everyone will be asking us this. And we who have been prodded so much, we who have asked ourselves this same question a hundred times already, we have not found and are not finding any better answers...

Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, 123.[1]

Six: Translation as Material-Semiotic In(ter)vention

In my previous chapter, I contrasted an affirmative biopolitics with what I'd risked calling a biopolitics of double affirmation. Crucial to this distinction was a further one between an affirmation of the active, productive and creative powers of life and subjectivity which, I wrote, risked an indistinguishability with the technocapitalist enframing of the earth that Heidegger reads in Nietzsche's philosophy, and a passive invention of the other, preparing a place to let the other come, more akin to the promise of the Earth I've discussed since chapter 1. I showed Derrida argue that the deaths of an incalculable number of living beings, and, as I cite in epigraph, languages, are made unrecognizable by certain machinations of technoscientific capitalism working to blur the distinction between making die and letting die. To recall the primary stakes of this dissertation, biocultural diversity, "the diversity of life in all its manifestations – biological, cultural, and linguistic – which are interrelated within a complex socio-ecological adaptive system," is critically threatened today.[2] The invention of the other I discussed in chapter 5, by contrast, engages a notion of letting life live-on – anterior to the

opposition between activity and passivity, and, what comes down to the same, the erasure of this opposition – more amenable to biocultural sustainability.

Through Foucault, I pursued my investigation of the overlaps between science, biopolitics and translation in fuller detail. Foucault explains that the sixteenth century ought to be understood as the age of resemblances, within which nature gives itself to be thought in marks and signatures, as writing or the "primary Text." (MC 93/88)

> In its raw, historical sixteenth-century being, language is not an arbitrary system; it has been set down in the world and forms a part of it, both because things themselves hide and manifest their own enigma like a language and because words offer themselves to men as things to be deciphered. The great metaphor of the book that one opens, that one pores over and reads in order to know nature, is merely the reverse and visible side of another transference, and a much deeper one, which forces language to reside in the world, among the plants, the herbs, the stones, and the animals. (MC 49-50/38-9)

The classical age of the seventeenth and eighteenth Centuries would split apart words and things, language and the world, the sayable and the visible according to the logic of representational thought. Foucault importantly distinguishes representation from translation: representation is so coextensive with classical thought that language itself becomes invisible, or at least totally unproblematic. As with natural history, the task of general grammar is to construct a perfectly analytical, 'well-made' language. Because general grammar and logic are completely superimposed, the difficulties encountered in translating between languages are more the result of incompatible sequences of words than any fundamental difference in their sense.[3] The scientific discourse subtending these surface differences is universal: knowledge and language totally overlap in the classical age. "They share, in representation, the same origin and the same functional principle... The sciences are well-made languages, just as languages are sciences laying fallow." (MC 101/95-6) Both science and language have as their task the univocal ascribing of names to the things of the world.

The modern age by contrast heralds the retreat of representationalist thought. Analogously to the role of natural history with respect to biology, general grammar yields its place to philology. Like the organization of the living being, the flexional system of a language is extrinsic to the logic of representation, referring thought to a deeper, inaccessible dimension.[4] Just as natural history gives way to the original force and striving of life itself, language becomes understood in terms of a speaking people; "so language, in the whole architecture of its grammar, makes visible the fundamental will that keeps a whole people alive and gives it the power to

speak a language belonging solely to itself." (MC 303/316) Following Humboldt, also of importance to ecolinguistics on this point, Foucault identifies language not as an *ergon*, an instrument or a product, but the activity of an *energeia*. But this new condition also promises language to its finitude, recognizing its limits before the infinity of its task: if language remains a necessary mediation for any scientific *objectivity*, it is bound to the finite knowing *subject*.[5] It is instructive to inquire into the relations between scientific knowledge, language and ethics, and those between an organism and its environment. Ethics for Foucault does not come from a transcendent prescription: "any imperative is lodged within thought and its movement towards the apprehension of the unthought." (MC 338-9/357) This law of thinking the unthinkable is what I will attempt to develop here with language and translation, itself a way for the living being to structure and be structured by its environment resisting any simple division between inside and outside, realism and constructivism, the material and semiotic. Translation exposes language to its own impossibility; more than an exoticism or othering, although this risk is always present, another language brings with it "*another system of thought, is the limitation of our own, the stark impossibility of thinking* that." (MC 7/xvi)

For this concluding chapter, I want to bring back Derrida's notion of general text I've discussed throughout, particularly since the notion of *pro-gramme* therein resists a humanist, logocentric and teleological account of science. As I argued in chapter 1, to think life as originary repetition or re-production is to think it as originarily inscribed in a network of differences that can be called arche-writing or general text. In any scientific investigation, the knowing subject, their object of study and whatever concept, metaphor or analogy by which the latter is analyzed are all to be understood as effects of the general text of life death. "The text is not a third term in the relation between the biologist and the living being, it is the very structure of the living being as the structure common to the biologist as a living being – to science as the production of life, and the living being itself." (L4, 5*t*) The difference between the so-called 'natural' and 'human' sciences loses its rigour, as do – for my purposes – any fixed distinction between the biological, the cultural and the linguistic. Derrida likewise sees translation as irreducible to the opposition between (mechanical) production and (organic) reproduction, as I noted from his seminar on Benjamin. Life and translation, life *in* translation are textualized in their originary repetition and re-production. A text begins in translation, and this is the very condition of its living-on; it negotiates total translatability and total untranslatability. The text

and the living being, he adds, "not only reproduces itself but induces itself as re-production, its repro-translation." (L6, 2*t*) Organic and inorganic life can thereby no more be reduced to an *ergon* than *energeia*; beyond any metaphysical notion of essence, the principle of their re-production is *outside* them, in their environment, and inscribes itself within.

> It is because alterity is irreducible therein that there is nothing but text, it's because no term, no element is sufficient or even has an effect if it does not refer to the other and never to itself that there is text, and it's because the text-set cannot close in on itself that there is only text, and that the so-called 'general' text (an evidently dangerous and only polemical expression) is neither a set nor a totality: it can neither comprehend itself nor be comprehended [*il ne peut ni se comprendre ni être compris*]. But it can write and read itself, which is something else. (L6, 4*t*)

For Derrida, one could say that translation does not take place between two pre-existing languages, but is rather the condition of possibility of any language in the first place. While there may be effects of language, message, information or communication, "information does not inform about something, communication does not communicate anything, the message does not emit something that would not itself already be a message, communication or information." (L6, 4*t*) What then appears as a limit to scientific objectivity is the very condition of any scientificity for Derrida. Error, nonknowledge and death are not external accidents supervening upon a system but the structural inscription of its outside within: "supplementarity is inscribed in the very definition of every system, and even of every living or non living system." (L6, 13*t*) General ecology, let's recall, thinks both the play of translatability and untranslatability that keeps an organism, language, text or worldview alive as it does the aneconomic, the wholly other, the untranslatable and ultimately the expenditure without reserve of death. This is the salient point of thinking another language in translation: to think something that does not have the same time, life death, ecology, world or matter as me or us; this is what I will call translation as the impossible invention of the wholly other, making no attempt to master time, the other or the earth, but lets the other come or perhaps *return*, and lets the other live-on on earth.

It is with Antoine Berman, founding figure in 'the ethical turn' in Translation Studies, that I will develop the notion of translation as a material-semiotic in(ter)vention. In *Translation and the Letter,* Berman claims translation must be thought as an experience in Heidegger's sense: "to undergo an experience with something – be it a thing, a person, or a god – means that this something befalls us, strikes us, comes over us, overwhelms and transforms us." (GA *12* 149/57) But this experience is to be distinguished from any usual sense of activity:

> when we talk of 'undergoing' ['*machen*'] an experience, we mean specifically that the experience is not of our own making; to undergo here means that we endure, suffer it, receive it as it strikes us and submit to it. It is this something itself that comes about, comes to pass, happens. To undergo an experience with language, then, means to let ourselves be properly concerned by the claim of language by entering into and submitting to it. (GA *12* 149/57)

To reflect on translation as experience, Berman argues, is to open up the totality of its field to its dimension of transcendence. Translation, transcendence and transgression all interrupt economy for Derrida, and Berman similarly calls for a shift from a 'restricted translation' – translation as communication between languages – to the 'generalized translation' one finds in Novalis, Roman Jakobson, George Steiner and Michel Serres.[6] "Not only in the aesthetic domain, but also in that of the sciences and, finally, in human experience in general... translation is always much more than translation." (BE 292/183) This surpassing of the usual sense of translation – a '*dépassement de sens*' akin to the *pas de sens* I discussed in Bataille and Blanchot – "*announces the experience of what one could call the other translation, the other translation which, so to speak, dissimulates itself in every translation*." (BT 21) I'd shown that transgression for Blanchot always operates through passion, patience and passivity. Berman understands the *über* in *übersetzung* precisely along the logic of a "*passage au-delà*." (BA 148) Within the 'passages' between languages in translation is hidden "a whole series of other 'passages' concerning the act of writing and, more secretly still, *the act of living and dying*." (BT 21) A passive experience of the impossible other, a shift from restricted to general translation, translation as transcendence and the passage of a *pas* binding together the secrecies of life death all come together in the articulation between the ethics of translation and what Berman calls the letter, and I'll call materiality.[7]

Berman draws from Steiner in evoking a sadness accompanying any experience of translation, a suffering in both the translator and the translated text.[8] Berman also takes his cue from Derrida in elaborating the mourning resulting from cutting apart the materiality of the letter and its meaning. In chapter 1, I showed how materiality constitutes the very impossibility of translation for Derrida.[9] Matter, nonetheless, bites back. "What is denied – materiality – has its revenge. Translation discovers at its expense that letter and sense are at once dissociable and indissociable." (BT 42) Berman calls a metaphysical or Platonist theory of translation one seeking to uncover the idealities subtending the deformations of material finitude, an argument I

showed echoed in Husserl's Living Present and his philosophy of science. Translation here is absolutely possible. On the other hand, the inextricability of the letter and its sense configures all translation as betrayal and impossibility.[10] If matter and meaning are thought in terms of their mutual immanence, the simple reversal of Platonism, translation is absolutely impossible. Translation for Berman is "*one of the sites where Platonism is simultaneously demonstrated and refuted*." (BT 42) Both options, I'll show, are structured within a metaphysics of representationalism. The materiality of the letter grounding the work's untranslatability expresses the work's *resistance* to translation, but it also paradoxically calls for translation, attracting translation the more it resists it.[11]

Its im-possibility therefore demands to be thought otherwise. Berman follows Derrida in thinking translation as necessary but impossible or faulty.[12] The entanglement of matter and meaning, the material and semiotic, reiterates this complexity. This is what Berman takes as essential in Benjamin's task of the translator; not "a 'choice' between two possibilities of translation – sense *or* the letter... *it speculatively thinks the relation between sense and the letter in translation*."[13] (BA 177) Meaning does not disappear in translation, but finds itself re-ordered in relation to the letter.[14] It is in this sense of re-ordering that I will explore an ethical accountability entailed by the cuts and exclusions inherent to any translation. If translation necessarily deforms the materiality of the letter, the other thought of translation calls for a relationship that saves and maintains this materiality. Berman's ethical interpretation of translation draws from Levinas in framing its task as the recognition and reception of the other as other: fidelity to the letter of the text is coextensive with how one relates to the other, the world and existence, all of which are for Berman carnal, corporeal and tangible bodies.[15] One can extend Berman's interpretation of the work (*l'œuvre*) to any language or living being from the elephant to the protozoa, the work "opens on to the experience of a world," and not only *a* world but *the* world, as Derrida might put it. (BT 70) This is why Berman follows Benjamin in breaking with the notion of translation as communication towards one of *manifestation*, I'd say invention; to open a space, to prepare a place for the other is the manifestation of a manifestation, "because the only possible definition of a *work* can only be made in terms of manifestation. In a work, it is the 'world' that, each time in another manner, is manifested in its totality." (BT 76) The text, a living being, language or species, along with their systemic, evolutionary and ecological relations to others, are also "pure newness, pure irruption

[*surgissement*]." (BT 76) The task of translation for Berman is thus "to manifest in *one's* language this pure newness in preserving the face of its newness." (BT 76) And this is where one must think of translation as a material-semiotic in(ter)vention; translation cuts apart and re-enacts the entanglement of matter and meaning anew and otherwise. These cuts inevitably entail exclusions, and must be able to be called into account in an ethics of biocultural sustainability. This is what Derrida and Cixous develop with the word '*voile*': [veil, but also *vois-le*, see it] both the word and the thing, the semiotic and the material as heralding a language-to-come, an event of language capable of making and letting events come. What lets this language come is where the idiom resists translation but does not forbid it. Rather, the event of translation occurs when it keeps something of the untranslatable, something resisting the economy of semiotic equivalency. Translation itself becomes a material-semiotic veil, "it lets one see and it conceals at the same time. Therefore translation – itself as an event that is a different event than that of the language of origin, or the so-called original text – makes something come about by reproducing or multiplying veiling effects with all the ambiguity this word can have." (LV 40*t*)

Commenting on the French title of Foucault's *The Order of Things* [Les Mots et les choses; *Words and Things*], Derrida writes, that

> the *and* of the title, *Words* and *Things* is wholly otherwise than any *and* that would simply connect words among themselves or things among themselves. Between words *and* things, there can be no conjunction or homogenous collection, no enumeration or simple addition, etc. Words and things neither add themselves together nor follow one another in a same series. (ETC 22*t*)

In fact, one could say that the material-semiotic neither juxtaposes/opposes (*et*) nor identifies (*est*) the material and the semiotic, such relations are effects of a material-semiotic *la vie la mort*. This discussion carries over to Derrida's reading of Novalis, who he sees as breaking from the classical metaphor of the book of nature. Beyond the dialectics of juxtaposition or opposition, 'le livre *est* la nature' and 'le livre *et* la nature,' the graphic of supplementarity overflows, in fact doubles any science or literature that would rest on an already constituted sense; *physis-in-différance* relates the identity of any material-semiotic event, any communication to its *dé-pense*; its ex-penditure, its un-thinking.[16] Derrida elsewhere calls this the intervention of writing as dissemination.[17]

In this chapter, I will begin in §6.1.1 by introducing several problems within and common to Science and Technology Studies (STS), Translation Studies (TS) and ecolinguistics.

§6.1.2 will develop the notion of translation in STS and the ethics and politics of the material-semiotic and naturecultures of Donna Haraway and Bruno Latour. §6.2 will explore nonrepresentationalist accounts of science in a general ecological context; Arkady Plotnisky, Karen Barad and Vicki Kirby's readings of complementarity in §6.2.1 and Cary Wolfe's account of autopoiesis in §6.2.2, to better develop the groundwork needed for a thought of translation more amenable to biocultural sustainability. I will build on systems theory through Sergey Tyulenev's application of Niklas Luhmann to Translation Studies in §6.2.3 in framing what I will call ecosystemic translation: an articulation between what I identify as two translational issues in ecolinguistics, *the translation of ecology* and *the ecology of translation.* §6.3.1 develops the translation of ecology via the ecolinguistic notion of the language of environment: the material-semiotic engagements through which different languages construct their relations to the world – some more sustainably than others – which prompts the question of what thought of translation might be needed to learn from the lessons of traditional ecological knowledge in a non-appropriative way. §6.3.2, however, builds on the ecolinguistic notion of the environment of language – the ecological, ethico-political and linguistic relations a language has with its others – to situate a necessary contextuality of any translation of ecology within an ecology of translation, which I develop through key thinkers in the ethics and politics of translation, particularly Berman, Michael Cronin and Lawrence Venuti. In §6.4, I conclude my discussion of ecosystemic translation, and argue for a posthumanist thought of translation to come, rethinking the promise of the earth I began with as the promise of biocultural diversity.

§6.1: Language, Ecology and Science in Translation

§6.1.1: Between Ecolinguistics, Translation Studies and Science and Technology Studies

Let me suggest that a thesis of total translatability between languages operates in complicity with traditional scientific realism: if languages, like scientific investigation, are understood to adequately map the same external reality, then translation must consist in uncovering the linguistic universals underlying surface-level differences between languages. One could argue that such frameworks are inherently conservative in appealing to nature as a fixed referent, in dislodging translation and science from socio-culturo-political constraints and in reifying the objects of their analyses as discrete, self-identical and non-relational. Shared concerns over this conservativism have motivated myriad turns to constructivism alongside which, at the risk of

generalizing, a thesis of total untranslatability has been adopted. Each language constructs a different reality and translation rendered impossible, just as every practice of scientific investigation undermines any claim to pure objectivism. While it is not my intention to dispute the political value of these approaches, there is a sense in which constructivism remains bound to the logic of representationalism it targets in traditional realism, and is thus just as ill-equipped in addressing the irrecoverable loss of the world's biocultural diversity.

Despite both their shared theoretical and ethico-political concerns, very little has been undertaken in the way of reading the insights of Translation Studies and Science and Technology studies (STS) through one another. Donna Haraway's work provides an early point of convergence; just as Derrida had explored the biological account of the elementary processes of the living cell as arche-writing, *pro-gramme* and general text, she identifies a common move between communication sciences and modern biologies: "the translation of the world into a problem of coding, a search for a common language in which all resistance to instrumental control disappears and all heterogeneity can be submitted to disassembly, reassembly, investment, and exchange."[18] A similar concern is voiced by ecolinguist Peter Mühlhäusler, who argues that the general trend in globalization has been one towards total inter-translatability with what he calls Standard Average European (SAE) languages, with even the constructions of many new languages undertaken with the precise intent of their total translatability with the languages of the West.[19] This globalatinization, rooted in humanist and colonial conceptions of science and technology, works to silence and exclude minority voices, languages and ideas that would interrupt its trend towards total homogenization, interrupt the global mechanisms of techno-capitalist biopower and their complicity with the degradation of the earth's biological, cultural and linguistic diversity.

It is on this point that Haraway invokes her infamous idea of the cyborg, which serves as an important illustration of the necessity of a posthumanist theory of translation, complicating any assured opposition between the organic and technological, natural and cultural, non-human and human. As she writes, the codification of the world as quantifiable elements of information "allows *universal translation*, and so unhindered instrumental power (called effective communication)."[20] Science itself "has been about a search for translation, convertibility, mobility of meanings, and universality... when one language (guess whose) must be enforced as the standard for all the translations and convergences."[21] What Haraway calls the frameworks of

situated knowledges and cyborg politics will engage "the struggle for language and the struggle against perfect communication, against the one code that translates all meaning perfectly."[22] Such a struggle involves a new concept of science invoking responsibility at its heart in its capacity for being called into account for translations:

> decoding and transcoding plus translation and criticism; all are necessary. So science becomes the paradigmatic model not of closure, but of that which is contestable and contested. Science becomes the myth not of what escapes human agency and responsibility, but rather accountability and responsibility for translations and solidarities linking the cacophonous and visionary voices of the knowledge of the subjugated.[23]

Translation Studies and Science Studies share this belief in the ethical and political potentials of interrupting fluent communication. As I will show with ecolinguistics, debates between realism and constructivism, translatability and untranslatability may themselves be short-circuited by understanding how languages differentially materialize relationships to the environment over long periods of ecological adaptation. I argue here that to think the relationship between translation and materiality through such an insight proposes important consequences for biocultural sustainability. For Mühlhäusler,

> languages are strictly speaking not translatable, as each of them suggests a different perspective on reality. It is the diversity of perspectives constructed that is of ecological importance. Not only are languages well adapted to the environmental conditions they developed in, linguistic diversity is also a resource of environmental knowledge.[24]

Conversely, if all languages were totally translatable, the loss of linguistic diversity would merely represent a decrease in the superficial surface structures of fundamentally identical languages. The relative ease with which we can translate between different SAE languages is not an endorsement of total effability since these languages share almost total conceptual and structural overlap for Mühlhäusler.[25]

On my reading, this untranslatability implies that language and matter are originarily entangled, and this paradoxically but necessarily ethically obligates translation to work for the preservation and sustainability of minority languages, as much for their own sake and that of diversity itself as for their capacity to expose the destructive blind-spots of our own SAE ecological materializations. It is commonly understood in ecolinguistics that languages, much like species, cannot be individually preserved outside of their 'ecological support systems,' which includes considerations of factors such as other languages from which to borrow and internal dialect variation; their ecological relationality without and within.[26] Citing the general

lack of success in preserving languages through their documentations in grammars and dictionaries, as Derrida echoes in my epigraph from *Monolingualism of the Other*, an ecological theory of linguistic preservation must ask "what is the support system that sustains a language economy over time?" [27] For David Harmon, one must preserve ecological *processes* of speciation, linguistic and biological.[28] Many ecolinguists now refer to 'linguistic speciation' as their key object of inquiry. To put it otherwise, our obligation in preserving biocultural diversity would seem not to lie within an inherent individual right to life itself, but rather of providing the ecological conditions of life through which organic and anorganic life; archaea, bacteria, plants, fungi, animals, cultures and languages can all live and die at their own rhythms.

What is ecolinguistics, and how ought languages be considered ecologically? Ecolinguistics has its beginnings in a 1972 paper by Einar Haugen entitled "The Ecology of Language." Haugen adopts the following definition of ecology from Haeckel; "the total science of the organisms' *relations* to the surrounding environment in which we can count in a wider sense all *conditions of existence*."[29] For Haugen, the ecology of language is defined as "the study of *interaction* between any given language and its environment."[30] In other words, ecology in this sense refers to the relationships a language has to other languages, its socio-historico-political context: *the environment of language*. A 1990 paper by M.A.K. Haliday, "New Ways of Meaning," brought the question of environmentalism into the study of linguistic structure itself: *the language of environment*. Halliday criticized SAE languages for reducing processes to objectified nouns, which he argues plays an important role in the ecological crisis. The notion that 'the environment' is an object apart from humanity is an example of this grammar. This critique of linguistic structures goes hand in hand with a critique of the language these structures make possible and impossible in discourse about the environment, referred to alternatively as 'eco-critical discourse' or 'critical ecolinguistics.' Of course, ecolinguist Alwin Fill notes that these two branches – the environment of language and the language of environment – are complementary.[31] If understanding languages ecologically offers us an alternative methodology for preserving languages with differently encoded constructions of ecological relationality, and we can learn from these languages by contrasting their structures against our own to reveal the blind spots of the latter, not only are we in a better position to talk about environmental issues in progressive and constructive ways, we are constantly developing our awareness of how to preserve the earth's biocultural diversity.

Similarly, it is surprising how little work has been done on ecolinguistic issues in Translation Studies. Important theorists like Lawrence Venuti and Michael Cronin have engaged the notion of a translational ecology or an ecology of translation, and I will build on these insights below. If there is an ethical imperative, an *ought* that must be entered into relation with the very *is* of biocultural diversity, it seems that the ethics of translation would have a key role to play for the following reasons: ecological relations between languages can be thought of through translation, the capacity to learn from a pool of diverse ecological knowledge is impossible without translation (however aporetically untranslatable this knowledge may be), and also because Translation Studies and ecolinguistics equally share an important concern: the protection of minority languages. As Cronin argues, "the issue of minority languages is not a peripheral concern for beleaguered fans of exotic peoples gabbling in incomprehensible tongues, but the single most important issue in Translation Studies today."[32] Translation allows us to recalibrate the dominant paradigms of majority languages by challenging their self-identity and revealing their ecological blind-spots. Finally, translation, as an ethics of reading (like deconstruction) can be closely aligned with a concept of ecolinguistics and environmental ethics as ecological literacy. For Frans Verhagen, "the first and basic challenge of the ecolinguistic community is to be Earth literate... to engage in the political formulation of an ecological identity, where the ecological consciousness is *translated* into the rough and tumble of the value-systems that are still predominantly human-centered and mechanistic."[33] But again, this is not to posit nature or the environment as the pure textuality within which Foucault reads the pre-classical age. Rather, it ought to be thought as where general ecology intersects with arche-writing, where the articulations between inside and outside, reading and writing, realism and idealism, system and environment find themselves thoroughly implicated and complicated. It is in this sense that the concept of *ecosystemic translation* I will develop will serve as an articulation between *the ecology of translation* – the study of the social, political and historical contexts between languages that any translation must undertake to promote the survival of minority languages – and *the translation of ecology* – the material-semiotic in(ter)ventions through which other linguistically constructed patterns of living with others – are translated into our dominant paradigms, interrupt their hegemony and reveal their destructive blind spots.

The relationships between languages and reality must be rethought if translation is to play a role in sustaining the earth's minority languages and local knowledges, as must the very

concept of ecology. In this sense, translation has much to gain from being thought as a material-semiotic (to use Haraway's term), or material-discursive (Barad's) in(ter)vention.[34] But while much work in STS, particularly for important feminist concerns, emphasizes a recalibration of the concepts of activity, agency and performativity (as is also the case in Translation Studies), there are other important reasons to remain suspicious of an extensionist logic which would return agency to a materiality once denied it. At its worst, this seriously risks the recuperation of these emancipatory discourses into the very logics of sovereignty it targets; one does not have to venture too deeply into in high-tech versions of posthumanism, affirmative biopolitics, and object-oriented ontology to find discourses entirely complicit with the technocapitalist enframing of the earth.[35] I propose Derrida's term 'in(ter)vention,' his own intervention into invention itself, as evoking a posthumanism not so much concerned with returning to the nonhuman what it was once denied but interrogating a shared material-semiotic passivity and finitude across organic and inorganic life. More ethically binding than the turn to a (restricted) concept of immanence in the literature, such a thought would engage the material-semiotic as a transcendence without a contrary, to borrow Latour's phrase.

One will find little support for an ecological and material conception of language along classical models of science. An important starting point for any comparative analysis of ecolinguistics and Translation Studies is their shared rejection of the positivism, dualism, objectivism and reductionism of traditional science, and their emphasis on the invariably normative, contextual and sociopolitical dimensions of observation and inquiry. As I will show, claims to objectivity go hand in hand with an individualism of discrete entities incompatible with ecological thinking and the ethics of translation for many of these theorists. The idea that individual languages can be abstracted from the ecological contexts of the communities that speak them has proven unsuccessful in attempts to preserve biocultural diversity, as noted above. As Cronin writes, the natural and social sciences continue to be dominated by a reductionist Newtonian paradigm, the universalist claims of which "provide a powerful underpinning for pretensions to Western cultural superiority."[36] Another theorist adds that "the claims of philosophy and science to universality are false claims disguising the imperialistic tendencies of a master narrative shot through and through with Eurocentric bias."[37] Venuti is equally critical of what he calls "linguistic-oriented approaches... promot[ing] scientific models of research," as an impediment to Translation Studies.[38] "By repressing the heterogeneity of language, the scientific

model prevents translators from understanding and evaluating what their practices admit and exclude, and what social relations those practices make possible." [39] Linguistics-based approaches to translation "restrict its role in cultural innovation and social change," "reinforc[e] dominant domestic values," and "block the ethical and political agenda" of translation.[40]

Alwin Fill argues for a participatory, I would say situated, scientific approach to linguistics emphasizing Humboldt's concept of '*wechselwirkung*,' or networked mutuality of observer and observed. Rom Harré, Peter Mühlhäusler and Jens Brockheimer echo this in claiming that both environmental and language studies should reject any claim to a separation between observer and observed, precluding the possibility of wholly objective knowledge.[41] Proponents of 'dialectical' linguistics Jørgen Christian Bang and Jørgen Døør note that ecolinguistics ought not be understood as a branch of linguistics among others, but "a genuine alternative to traditional, positivist linguistics and its paradigm of and for the sciences."[42] The idea that a language is a self-enclosed, self-identical entity that can be studied in itself, free of external factors and value judgements in fact constitutes an important part of the ecological crisis, while what they identify as a properly 'dialectical' theory of language ought to reverse this destructive trend. In isolating language from its external factors, linguistics can only remain mute regarding ecological destruction and language death. The model they pose instead suggests that "philosophy, linguistics, and science only achieve their true *raison d'être* when they aim at increasing our understanding of ourselves, our relations to others and our environment, and when these relationships work toward greater democracy, greater ecological sensibility, and more peaceful means and goals."[43] Mühlhäusler similarly writes that the 'independency hypothesis of linguistics,' or the positivist framework through which languages are reified as self-contained isolated objects that can be counted and named is a reflection of Enlightenment ideals and European political practices, and constitutes the greatest problem of linguistics as well as a major obstacle to understanding language change and preserving endangered languages.[44] "Far from being an act of objective description, [this approach] can constitute a very serious trespass on the linguistic ecology of an area."[45] Recalling Heidegger, linguistics ought therefore sever its atomistic and Cartesian-rooted practice of 'thinking the world to bits' if it is to play a positive role in the environmental crisis.[46]

Several theorists in environmental ethics have postulated a direct connection between a Cartesian-Newtonian worldview and the liberal individualism through which free-market

capitalism justifies environmental destruction.[47] Similarly, it can be argued that the traditional dualisms of Western translation such as fidelity and betrayal, original and translation, source and target texts are complicit with a colonial and imperialistic program as well as the ever-increasing extinction of languages worldwide. Harmon argues that romantic individualism is anathematic to ecological thinking and the valuing of biodiversity. "Ecology teaches us that all things are bound together in overlapping biotic communities – and the Byronic hero is no part of that kind of community."[48] Venuti also writes that the desire for fluency in translation is linked to these very same romantic conceptions of subjectivity and the values of humanism and individualism.

> The translator's invisibility is also partly determined by the individualistic conception of authorship that continues to prevail in Anglo-American culture. According to this conception, the author freely expresses his thoughts and feelings in writing, which is thus viewed as an original and transparent self-representation, unmediated by transindividual determinants (linguistic, cultural, social [*and ecological*]) that might complicate authorial originality.[49]

The result of this individualism is, he argues, a concern of translation and relations with cultural others that is "imperialistic abroad and xenophobic at home."[50] Against this, Venuti posits a relational concept of identity more conducive to ethico-political pursuits.[51] To deny this relational dependency, Cronin adds, "leads to the fetish of autonomy and an obsessive concern with unconditional freedoms."[52]

It is important to note, however, that the individualistic transparency of the translator is not a universal ideal.[53] As Judi Wakabayashi and Rita Kothari argue in their collection of non-Western approaches to translation, bilingual and multilingual cultures are likely more accustomed to experiences of 'living in translation.' Consequently, "monocultural cultures are more likely to be aware of translation as a distinct *act*."[54] What I am attempting to think as ecosystemic translation must thus be reconceptualized beyond traditional oppositions of objectivity and subjectivity, description and normativity. Calling to mind Derrida, proponent of linguistic human rights Tove Skutnabb Kangas argues that we tend to divide the disappearances of languages between language murder, in which a language is *actively killed*, 'making a language die,' and language death, in which a language 'naturally' lives out its life, *passively* 'letting a language die' through 'unsupported coexistence.' On the framework of liberal individualism rooted in representationalist models of science, only language murder is seen as linguicide, she argues. However, there is nothing 'natural' about the kind of language death the

world is currently facing; letting die comes down to making die. The same argument of course holds for species extinction.[55] Conversely, and building on the insights of my previous chapters, I will argue that the ethics posed by ecosystemic translation comes down to letting life live on, irreducible to this opposition of activity and passivity, making and letting. Such an account will be difficult to develop through the traditional models of science targeted by Translation Studies and ecolinguistics. Harré, Muhlhausler and Brockheimer state exactly that Western scientific discourse as it stands is insufficient for understanding the environment.[56] However, theorists in both Translation Studies and ecolinguistics have begun to search for alternative models within quantum physics, while others have explored possibilities in systems theory.[57] I'll turn to these in §6.2, but will first examine how the notion of translation plays into Science and Technology Studies in developing the ethics and politics of the material-semiotic and the natural-cultural.

§6.1.2: Naturecultures and the Material-Semiotic

One should be careful to distinguish what I'll explore as the material-semiotic from a simple return to a 'premodern' textualization (in the narrow sense) of nature. The material-semiotic does not express the reciprocal immanence of matter and meaning, nature and culture but calls for a wholly other logic. The situated nature of knowledge in science and language by definition rejects a pure immediate gaze prior to all intervention that sees a world where words and things are not yet separated.

It is in the vein of similar anxieties concerning the concept of modernity that Latour situates *We Have Never Been Modern*.[58] His project attempts to render thinking accountable to what he calls the hybrids of nature and culture that weave together our world in a "seamless fabric [*tissu sans couture*]," the keys to which are the synonymous notions of 'translation' and 'network.'[59] Latour explains modern thought as characterized by a series of paradoxes playing on the transcendence and immanence of nature and society, where the transcendence of either explains their existence prior to human construction, while their immanence denotes the action of our own construction; constructivism in the narrow sense. What thereby allows modern thought to say and do anything, by way of this simultaneous play of transcendence and immanence, is enshrined in the guarantee of Latour's 'modern constitution' stating that Nature and Culture must be absolutely distinct.[60] Modern thought is based on two separate and distinct sets of practices; one of *translation*, mediation or network that produces natural-cultural hybrids, and one of

purification that attempts to keep humans and non-humans apart across an ontological divide.[61] While both translation/mediation and purification require one another and would be impossible or irrelevant without one another, modernity insists on considering them separately and works to make translation invisible. To consider purification and translation together is to cease to be modern. But, as the title of his book implies, we have never been modern when we realize that the two have always already been at work. In fact, Latour's hypothesis can be read along the lines of the logic of ex-appropriation that I developed in my chapter on Heidegger; the more the work of purification attempts to keep nature and culture separate, the more it facilitates the proliferation of their hybridization and contamination. What one could call a dialectics between transcendence and immanence renders modern thought invincible and absolutely sovereign by making translation invisible and unthinkable.[62] Modernity is thus able to assure both the total separation between the human and its other in the same move as it cancels out this separation [la vie *et* la mort = la vie *est* la mort].[63] To put it otherwise, modernity makes use of both translation and purification while only representing the work of the latter.

As Latour would later argue in *Politics of Nature*, 'political ecology' must abandon the very concept of nature; the ecological crisis is a crisis in objectivity, grounded in the naturalistic separation between fact and value, ontology and politics, a common world and the common good. To think the work of translation together with that of purification corresponds exactly to what I've developed as general ecology; we have never been modern because what makes the dialectical interplay of transcendence and immanence, realism and idealism, nature and culture, ontology and ethics possible binds them to their absolute outside, what Latour calls a 'transcendence without contrary,' the unthinkable and impossible underside of this dialectic. Perhaps the wholesale abandonment of 'nature' is not what is necessary for political ecology, but rather to think nature as originarily de-naturing itself. Latour insists that the non-modern constitution must preserve 'deconstruction' and 'denaturalization' from the 'postmoderns.' But the nonmodern constitution is no more a return to the premodern than a turn to the postmodern, even if it insists on keeping the non-separability of signs and words and the transcendence without contrary from the former.[64] Haraway outlines the ethico-political possibilities of such a refiguration of nature and its potentials for translation. To think nature as what she calls the coyote, the coding trickster, as the ground of these necessary and contradictory combinations "can show us that historically specific human relations with 'nature' must somehow –

linguistically, ethically, scientifically, politically, technologically, and epistemologically – be reimagined as genuinely social and actively relational; and yet the partners must remain utterly inhomogenous."[65] To politicize the grammar of our relations with nature enables Western discourses to

> come to linguistic terns with the non-representability, historical contingency, artefactuality, and yet spontaneity, necessity, fragility, and stunning profusions of 'nature' [and] help us refigure the kinds of persons we might be... and inescapably these refigurings must acknowledge this permanent condition of our fragility, mortality, and finitude.[66]

If the ecological crisis is indeed a crisis in objectivity, Haraway shows that objectivity must be rethought as "taking risks in a world where 'we' are permanently mortal, that is, not in final control."[67]

For Latour, the 'Great Divide' between humans and nonhumans in modernity gives way to another, that between Us and Them; the West and everyone else. Modernity homogenizes the infinite differences between all non-humans and all non-Westerners.[68] This asymmetry between nature and culture also carries over to one between past and future, the premodern and the modern; "*the past was the confusion of things and men; the future is what will no longer confuse them*."[69] Modernity is precisely this attempt to escape an age that confuses fact and value, matter and meaning, ontology and ethics towards a science that does not. Only in our society, he writes, "an unheard-of transcendence has manifested itself: Nature as it is, ahuman, sometimes inhuman, always extrahuman... there has been a total asymmetry between the cultures that took Nature into account and those that took into account only their own culture or the distorted versions that they might have of matter."[70] However, the concept of culture is itself the artefact of our own attempt to separate ourselves from nature; to cease to be the modern we have never been, to recognize that there have only ever been nature-cultures and to consider together the work of purification and translation, causes us to realize that "the moderns do not separate humans from nonhumans any more than the 'others' totally superimpose signs and things."[71]

The grounds for translation as an ethical, material-semiotic in(ter)vention requires what Haraway calls situated knowledges: a thought of all knowledges as embodied and partial, as resistant to the pure gaze of a detached view from nowhere as it is the subsumption of their parts into a holistic relationality, contradictorily attentive to both the constructivist aspects of our semiotic systems and a commitment to the materiality of the 'real' world.[72] Haraway understands

ethics as being accountable to this partiality, while irresponsibility is conversely the inability to be called into account. I would call irresponsibility the universal translation (and universal untranslatability) posed by representationalist models of science, both in their naive realist and constructivist forms. Conversely, accountability for the local knowledges in minority cultures and languages that interrupt universal translation is what I would call an ethics of translation. As Haraway is fully aware, however,

> here lies a serious danger of romanticizing and/or appropriating the vision of the less powerful while claiming to see from their positions... the standpoints of the subjugated are not 'innocent' positions. On the contrary, they are preferred because in principle they are least likely to allow denial of the critical and interpretive core of all knowledge.[73]

Positioned against the militarized science and technology of perfect communication and perfect languages, the feminist objectivity Haraway argues for entails an interpretive, critical and partial understanding of translation in the science and politics of interpretation.[74] Science becomes a question of accountability for difference within material-semiotic fields of meaning: "accountability and responsibility for translations and solidarities linking the cacophonous visions and visionary views that characterize the knowledge of the subjugated."[75] To return this to my questions in chapter 5, accountability is also a responsibility for how the boundaries of bodies are semiotically materialized within which what she calls techno-biopolitics;

> bodies as subjects of knowledge are material-semiotic generative nodes. Their boundaries materialize in social interaction, 'objects' like bodies do not pre-exist as such... perhaps our hopes for accountability in the techno-biopolitics in postmodern frames turn on revisioning the world as coding trickster with whom we must learn to converse.[76]

To lean to converse with the differential material-semiotic codings of nature, to be accountable for the exclusions our practices enact and responsible for translations involves, for me, what Latour calls a transcendence without contrary, one that extracts transcendence from its modern dialectic with immanence, and which lets translation to produce both natures and cultures.[77] This letting, again, is fully conversant with the thought of invention I outlined above. As Latour asks, "who told us that transcendence had to have a contrary? We are, we remain, *we have never left transcendence, that is, the maintenance in presence by the mediation of a pass* [par la médiation de l'envoi]."[78] While the modern practice of purification only concerned itself with stabilized essences, the translations and mediations at play therein deployed unstable events, processes; "a movement, a passage – literally a pass [*une passe*]... we start from a continuous and hazardous

existence – continuous because it is hazardous – and not of an essence."[79] In other words, translation, the non-dialectical mediation of the '*pas*,' its transcendence without contrary make it so that, beyond any dialectics of transcendence and immanence, realism and idealism, total translatability and total translatability, it lets something finitely remain and live-on.[80] What Latour calls the Parliament of Things – the Parliament of the Living as I borrowed from Wood – calls for a rethinking of democracy; biocultural sustainability as democracy-to-come, I would say; a democracy that can represent biocultural hybrids. In Latour's *Politics of Nature,* political ecology abandons the fact/value distinction, as well as that between the common world and the common good, towards what he calls a new exteriority. "For political ecology there is another transcendence, another externality, which owes nothing either to nature or to the arbitrariness of the Sovereign."[81] This transcendence and exteriority divides the powers of political ecology between the capacity to take into account and to put into order, and the ontological-ethical question becomes concerned "with the simple difference between *stopping* and *continuing* the movement of the progressive constitution of the good common world."[82] Nature in this sense gives way to a collective that is surrounded, indeed threatened, by the entities the collective externalizes and for which it is incapable of being held accountable. What the power to put into order excludes literally *haunts* the power to take into account.

> Such is the feedback loop of the expanding collective, a loop that makes it so very different from a society endowed with its representations, in the midst of an inert nature made up of essences whose list would be fixed once and for all, expecting from moral values a selection from on high so that it can extricate itself from mere matters of fact. All the transcendence one needs, in practice, to escape from the straitjacket of immanence is found there, on the outside, within reach.[83]

But I think we have to read this idea of within reach precisely as just always out of reach, structurally so; not as an Idea in the Kantian sense, but as the im-possible, even im-political outside of political ecology. Because the Parliament of Things – like every living thing and every translation – structures itself by its externalizations, no process of accountability can ever be completed once and for all. In this sense for Latour, the fact-value distinction, and even that between putting into order and taking into account, must give way to a deeper difference, "between, on the one hand, the short-circuit in the composition of the common world and, a slowing down that is made possible by due process, which I have chosen to call representation."[84] The goal of political ecology must be understood as "represent rather than

short-circuit."[85] But is there not a way in which short-circuiting the common world is itself an ethical-ecological gesture, as Haraway seems to suggest? Perhaps short-circuiting the good common world is precisely the logic by which to slow things down, to let life live-on and be accountable for translation in its material-semiotic in(ter)ventions. As I'll show, many are critical of the corrective of a democracy that merely extends citizenship to the nonhuman and their hybrids, of "a new *representationalist* form of government," as Barad puts it, noting that "representationalist governments have a long history of shoring up their 'own' borders while raiding and ravaging other lands."[86] I'll examine the need to go through this impasse in my discussions of complementarity and autopoiesis.

§6.2: Non-Representationalist Ecologies of Knowledge

§6.2.1: Complementarity and Posthumanism

In this section, I will draw from two approaches discussed in contemporary science studies – complementarity and autopoiesis – to develop the ethical and political potentials of thinking translation and the material-semiotic. Arkady Plotnitsky's analysis in *Complementarity: Anti-Epistemology after Bohr and Derrida* is particularly helpful in this regard as he develops Bohr's notion of complementarity by way of Bataille and Derrida's general economy, noting the influence of quantum physics on Bataille's own development of the concept. As he suggests, complementarity and general economy are themselves part of the same *oikonomia* in différance. Plotnitsky argues that classical science ought to be understood in terms of a restricted economy: a restricted economy of science takes the relations between its objects as always meaningful and controllable, privileges consciousness, meaning, presence and truth and aims at the development of a fully coherent and unified system of knowledge beyond error, loss or contingency. General economy relates these to non-sense, unproductive loss and multiplicity.

Bohr proposes complementarity to account for certain conflictual aspects of quantum systems, specifically both the heterogeneity and mutual exclusivity of these aspects and the necessity of their interaction in the description of any quantum phenomenon. For example, light can be represented as either a wave or a particle depending on the configurations of the measuring apparatus used. For Bohr, quantum physics must employ both incompatible systems of representation to give a complete description of its data without resolving these in a classical synthesis, dialectic or otherwise. As such, complementarity can be understood as a question of

general economy since it relates any of its descriptions to an ineluctable and ineradicable loss of sense. Far from considering this loss as an external accident befalling the description of a system, it must be considered as its very condition of possibility. The irreducible loss introduced by complementarity – always already affecting the representation of any quantum system – paradoxically provides the only possible completeness of its description.[87] In fact, this loss "prohibits one from assuming that there is somewhere a complete or unified system, existing in itself or by itself, concerning which system some information is lost in the process of observation, measurement, and interpretation."[88] In other words, complementarity fractures in advance any attempt to control or master the objects of one's investigation. The structure of general economy, however, allows complementarity to relate to this impossible loss of meaning. As Plotnitsky cites Derrida, recalling that general economy is indeed a *scientific* writing, "it is not the loss of meaning, but... the 'relation to this loss of meaning.' It opens the question of meaning. It does not describe unknowledge, for this is impossible, but only the effects of unknowledge." (ED 397/270) Complementarity breaks with restricted-economic accounts of 'knowledge-gathering' sciences, yet must of course incorporate their best possible knowledge. It could not prepare a place for the invention of the other or the radically unknowable without this. To think complementarity as general economy is thus a matter of taking into account this alterity and heterogeneity but without appropriating it into a system of knowledge. Beyond the oppositions of the representable and unrepresentable, the fully translatable and fully untranslatable that would return it to a restricted economy, complementarity engages a general economic *relation* to this unrepresentability and unknowability.[89]

For Plotnitsky, this structure engages a deconstruction of the classical concept of the event, or rather, engages a complementary relation between description and event that will be essential to thinking translation as invention. As I showed, the performative immediately neutralizes the eventfulness of the event it brings about in still presupposing too much mastery and technoscientific convention. One can read the traditional notion of the performative in terms of classical causality; the relationship between cause and effect Plotnitsky calls efficacy. By contrast, 'efficacity' describes the possibility of effects without causes, and is better suited to understand quantum events.[90] Efficacity, he adds, is alterity itself. "All the *effects* described via such terms, including the effects of various closures, are produced by this alterity-efficacity, making all our interpretation and theory, and all our approaches to this alterity itself, depend on

these effects."[91] It is precisely this thought of an effect without cause through which I will attempt to think material-semiotic entanglement in its *restance* and event.

For Plotnitsky, Bohr's complementarity entails a materialist deconstruction of the classical oppositions between inside and outside, subject and object. To think general economic loss or distortion as originary at the quantum level necessitates a rethinking of matter and causality: matter can no longer be understood as a self-present identity preexisting or prefiguring its quantum effects. "Bohr was perhaps the first to grasp fully that we can no longer speak of matter as an independent reality existing by itself... even though, at the same time, this 'matter' affects and constrains all observation, measurement, interpretation, and theory."[92] Building on Derrida's comments in *Positions* I examined in chapter 1, Plotnisky refigures complementarity as a general economy of matter. Matter becomes understood as its own alterity, heterogeneity and supplementarity in the efficacity of its event: I'd say matter becomes its own originary (material-semiotic) translation.[93] According to this logic, complementarity allows one to think of matter neither as a word nor concept but as its own dissemination and différance, along with its remaining or *restance* by which any system is overflowed.[94] But as Plotnitsky is careful to note, material resistance does not to posit an absolute alterity or exteriority, a total untranslatability that would return its logic to a restricted economy. There is no absolute exteriority or beyond if beyond means beyond the closure of arche-writing. The material remainder implied by complementarity is rather beyond the opposition of the absolutely knowable and unknowable: "a very different relation – if it is even a relation – is at stake that is contradictory or impossible from the classical point of view."[95]

It is in this *relation without relation* that we must think this material *restance* and its implications for translation. Again, the radical alterity of this matter cannot be accessed by way of the opposition between the representable or the unrepresentable, the translatable or the untranslatable. "The 'remainder' at issue must be seen as productive of further interpretive iterability at any point, or after any 'cut,' but not in the sense that there is anything that can exist as undisturbed at any point and then be disturbed or differently observed, measured, or interpreted."[96] However, no cut can ever be done once and for all, and its arbitrariness is precisely what articulates the shifting complementarity between inside and outside at the core of Bohr's thought of matter. It is in this cut that one can begin to think in(ter)vention: the cut interrupts both pure translatability and pure untranslatability, but its structural necessity obligates

general economy to be accountable to what restricted economies exclude. This has important political and ethical implications: "that which is left in the margins and claimed to be reducible or treated as contamination by classical theories... is not only incapable of being marginalized or reduced, but is in fact *constitutive* of that which is unequivocally opposed to these contaminating forces and supposed to be purified of them."[97]

Karen Barad investigates the ethical and political implications of quantum entanglement, where loss is refigured as the constitutively exclusionary nature of every material-semiotic practice, and ethics and accountability become a question of what possibilities these exclusions admit or, evidently, exclude. One finds many similarities here to discussions in Latour, Haraway and Plotnitsky, but it is Barad's commitment to a materialist justice-to-come, and her recent elaboration of these issues in an ecological – indeed eco-deconstructive context that confirms my hunch that translation has everything to gain from a more thorough engagement with matter.[98] As Barad explains, Bohr's complementarity breaks with representationalism in claiming that "*we are a part of the nature that we seek to understand*."[99] Complementarity rejects the notion that scientific measurement and language mediate an independent reality by way of representation.[100] Word and world, words and things, matter and meaning are inextricably and complementarily entangled, as are natural and scientific matters of fact with cultural matters of concern, value and care, all of which ought be understood as "ethico-onto-epistemological matter[s]."[101] Bohr understood this and accordingly emphasized the material and semiotic nature of practices, proposing what Barad calls a proto-performative account. Her own theory of performativity is in her words posthumanist, in that it attempts to go beyond theories of performativity that focus exclusively on the human and its language, and rather attempts to take into account what she calls matter's dynamism. She elaborates on this insight in shifting questions concerning linguistic and technoscientific representation to ones of *discourse*; in other words, from questions of descriptions and representations of reality to ones asking what realities and our practices make both possible and impossible given this entanglement.[102]

In affirming the independent existence of words and things, representationalism goes hand in hand with an ontology of metaphysical individualism, the idea that the world is composed of discrete and non-relational individual entities.[103] Recalling that it is precisely a conception of languages as self-identical and non-relational that ecolinguists argue must be rejected if the preservation of minority languages is to be successful, such ontological

considerations are essential to my project. Barad follows Bohr in proposing *phenomena* as the primary ontological units, but in a sense that must entail a general-ecological displacement of the restricted economy of phenomenology. Phenomena "do not merely mark the epistemological inseparability of observer and observed, or the results of measurements, rather, *phenomena* are the *ontological* inseparability of agentially intra-acting components."[104] Barad uses the term 'intra-action' in contrast to *inter*action, which envisions relationality as always between previously existing relata. Phenomena, by contrast, designate an originary relationality through which the relata themselves emerge.[105] Barad's framework thus "rejects the notion of a correspondence relation between words and things and offers in its stead a causal explanation of how discursive practices are related to material phenomena."[106] In other words, phenomena are themselves material-discursive. Barad thus refigures the entanglements between the two to propose a more robust account of the processes of materialization through which both discourses and matter come to matter: epistemologically, ontologically and ethically. What Barad calls 'agential separability,' a notion that rejects both questions of absolute interiority or exteriority as they do oppositions between determinism and free will, realism and constructivism, observer and observed, refigures exteriority as exteriority within material-discursive phenomena, a *beyond-within* as I'd put it.

> *Agential separability* is a matter of *exteriority within phenomena*... since phenomena are material-discursive, no priority is given to either materiality or discursivity; neither one stands outside the other. There is no geometrical relation of absolute exteriority between a 'causal apparatus' and a 'body effected,' or an idealistic collapse of the two, but rather an ongoing topological dynamics of enfolding whereby the spacetimematter manifold is enfolded into itself.[107]

Barad thus extends the concept of the scientific measuring apparatus to social material-discursive or naturalcultural practices of mattering. Apparatuses configure the world by differentially enacting cuts, constraints and exclusions that thereby differentially materialize boundaries, properties and meaning. "*Apparatuses are the material conditions of possibility and impossibility of mattering*; they enact what matters and what is excluded from mattering."[108] In this sense, the ethical political implications of this logic and, she adds, deconstruction more generally, "lies not simply in recognizing the inevitability of exclusion but in insisting on accountability for the particular exclusions that we enact and in taking up the responsibility to perpetually contest and rework these boundaries."[109] A deconstructive practice is "a practice of reading for the

constitutive exclusions of ideas we can not do without."[110] Of course, her concepts of accountability are indebted to Haraway's ideas of situated knowledges and the material-semiotic I detailed above, and pose important refigurations of the ethical and political resistances local knowledges pose to universal translation. Knowing for Barad is "a direct material engagement, cutting-together-apart, where cuts do violence but also open up agential conditions of possibility."[111] To ask what knowledges the cuts enacted by any material-semiotic translation make possible and impossible is to allow oneself to be called into account for their constitutive violence. Ethical concerns and questions of responsibility are at the very core of scientific-translational practices, with real, differential effects on the world's materializations.[112] "Questions of ethics are always already threaded through the very fabric of the world. They are not an additional concern that gets added on."[113]

Barad's deconstructive leanings force one to think the notions of 'agency' and 'enactment' otherwise. Dislodged from any humanist or classical concept of activity, responsibility becomes a matter of an ability *and inability* to respond. "Listening for the response of the other and an obligation to be responsible to the other, who is not entirely separate from what we call the self. This way of thinking ontology, epistemology, and ethics together makes for a world that is always already an ethical matter."[114] Again, this listening coheres closely with the thought of invention I have been elaborating here; to prepare a place to let the other come is of course the ethical task of translation as a material-semiotic in(ter)vention. An important consequence of these insights for translation is that it thus becomes dislodged from the humanism grounding its marginalization. More difficultly, it allows us to think a posthumanist thought of translation entailed by complementarity (a posthumanism as much after humanism as it implies the situation of the human in its ecological context, no more post-modern than pre-modern) which implies that "meaning [itself] is not a human-based notion; rather, meaning is an ongoing performance of the world in its differential intelligibility... The world articulates itself differently."[115]

For Vicki Kirby, this displacement of traditional humanism is a direct consequence of quantum entanglement. If entities do not preexist their relationality but rather emerge through this involvement, scientific inquiry or interpretation does not originate from a human inquirer.[116] Rather, these experimentations and translations might constitute nature's own investigations, readings and rewritings of itself.

> By studying the workings of language we are not merely looking at a *model* of the world's 'intra-actions' that, by dint of being detached from the world's palpable reality, will inevitably prove mistaken... we may be investigating and witnessing of a more general articulation and involvement whose collective expression *we are*.[117]

As with Barad, Kirby resists the idea that thinking a posthuman assemblage of nature *and* culture can somehow evade the ecologically destructive aspects of humanism. Latour's work in Actor Network Theory, while important in attempting to account for nonhumans, maintains the nature/culture divide by simply *extending* agency and inventiveness to matter and nature. Instead, Kirby develops the quantum implications of Derrida's notion of general text and grammatology as ecology, one that "open[s] the text, or any individual identification, to an interiority whose articulating energy is the entire system."[118] In other words, Derrida's famous idea that 'there is no outside-text' must be understood as suggesting that there is nothing outside of Nature; culture and nature are two expressions of the same phenomenon. This has profound implications for thinking translation as a material-semiotic in(ter)vention in the preservation of biocultural diversity, avoiding

> the naiveté that refuses the *question* of matter, here also, the *question* of language, by simply adding their presumed differences together, [which] marks a lack of rigor whose complacency appears time and again when the puzzle of relationality, difference, and implication is 'resolved' through terms that evoke conjunction, aggregation, assemblage, and connection.[119]

Against this notion, Kirby suggests all individuations and speciations reinvent the scene of arche-writing that is the general text of ecology.[120] Species and languages "might be likened to a 'restricted writing' which the general bodies forth."[121] Against any reading of deconstruction proposing that there is nothing outside of language, language is refigured as nature's own internal torsion, which again means that there is nothing outside of nature for Kirby.[122] This thought of ecology as life's own reading and writing of itself suggests the constitutive failure of both univocity and equivocity, I'd say total translatability and untranslatability, marking the project of both with an essential finitude within which "'the system's falling out of/with itself *is* the stammer of language."[123] If the entire system is thus its own decipherment, communication cannot be said to take place between two pre-existent identities and must therefore be rethought.[124] What might such a rethinking entail? Recalling Berman's rejection of translation as communication and, as Derrida writes in *Life Death*, "communication does not communicate anything, the message does not emit anything that is not in itself already a message,

communication, information," (L6, 4*t*) similarly to Luhmann, who suggests only communication – not humans – can communicate, what if only an originarily ahuman translation can translate?[125]

§6.2.2: Autopoiesis and Double Finitude

The turn to systems theory in this chapter will be recognized by readers of Translation Studies as significant since the 1970's with the Tel-Aviv/Leuven school and the polysystems theory of Itamar Even-Zohar, and as more recently expertly developed in Sergey Tyulenev's *Applying Luhmann to Translation Studies*. As I noted for Barad and Kirby, complementarity ought not be understood as implying the material and the semiotic in terms of their assemblage or hybridization in mutual immanence, rather, hybridity itself requires a certain reconceptualization (this is how I read, for example, Latour's account of a transcendence without contrary). At stake here is the necessity for any epistemological-ontological account of translation to enact cuts and exclusions, but also the deeper ethical question of being accountable to what these cuts make possible and impossible, and of being open toward their more inclusive, ecologically sensitive reiterations. What I wish to show here is that if we think of languages as autopoietic systems, then refiguring the paradoxes of communication between these as translation – translation being precisely the *boundary-event* of both organic and inorganic life – can have important implications for Translation Studies, Ecolinguistics and STS.

For Cary Wolfe, systems theory affords a more rigorous theorization of the hybrid and cyborg networks of Haraway and Latour in mobilizing both a continuity across previously distinct phenomena (nature/culture, nonhuman/human) and revealing the ultimately contingent nature of any language or scientific interpretation.[126] Wolfe's engagements with biologists Maturana and Varela's autopoiesis and Luhmann's abstraction of this concept to nonliving systems – languages in my case, but of course also biopolitical machines and any other epistemological-ontological-ethical interpretation – will be my guide here. Autopoiesis literally means self-producing; an autopoietic system produces itself according to its internal rules and operations; one could say the conventions legitimating its performativity.[127] Autopoietic systems are closed and self-referential at the level of their internal organization while structurally open to their material environment. However, this relationship between openness and closure is more complicated than their simple hybridization, as Wolfe explains: "environmental 'triggers' and

'perturbations' [...] take place on the level of structure, but what may be *recognized* as a perturbation or trigger is specified by the entity's organization and operational closure."[128] Autopoietic systems do not pick up information from their environments in a representationalist sense but "*bring forth a world* by specifying what patterns of the environment are perturbations and what changes trigger them in the organism."[129] This is not to say that they create a material world in an idealist or constructivist sense, but that what a system perceives as identity and difference is internal to the logic of its own structural differentiation from its environment. This requires rethinking identity and difference beyond their role in the play of representation Foucault sees in the classical age towards another logic, beyond any thought of the world as pre-given, whether internally (constructivism) or externally (realism). This originary difference allows Wolfe to bring Luhmann and Derrida together in what he calls the 'openness from closure' principle. Citing Luhmann, "the concept of a self-referentially closed system does not contradict the system's *openness to the environment*. Instead, in the self-referential mode of operational closure is a form of broadening possible environmental contacts."[130]

For humans, the bringing forth of and reflection upon the world occurs through language. And yet, language itself evolves from structurally ahuman processes of social life in which the interactions between certain organisms acquire a recurrent nature. As Derrida, Maturana and Varela echo, human language must be understood in a difference of degree from the signifying processes of other living beings.[131] To think the autopoietic structure of language forces us to think a certain decentering of the human, yielding "a posthumanist and transdisciplinary theory of the relation between the species, ethics, and language, conceived in its exteriority and materiality."[132] To take seriously the material and embodied structure of language is less for Wolfe a question of understanding our place in Latour's Parliament of Things than it is a call to situate an originary ex-propriation of the human.[133] It is in this sense that posthumanism as he interprets it is both before and after humanism, before in that it names the human's originary ecological and technological embededdness, and after, not just in decentering the human, but in changing the nature of thought and language itself in the ways that deconstruction, complementarity and autopoiesis entail.[134] I find this fully conversant with ecolinguistics: "your theory of language matters, and it matters not just epistemologically [...] or methodologically [...] because all sorts of consequences, both ontological and ethical, follow in its wake."[135] A post-humanist theory of language and translation, I suggest, will require "an increase in the vigilance,

responsibility, and humility that accompany a world so newly, and differentially, inhabited."[136] Wolfe suggests that we be "extraordinarily – indeed philosophically – attuned to how 'forms of language' (what we say, what we write, how we ask philosophical questions) opens up certain lines of thought – indeed, the imagining of whole worlds – and forecloses others."[137]

Important parallels with complementarity emerge here, particularly in terms of the loss entailed by every general ecology and the contradictory injunction to engage incommensurable systems in order to be accountable to the excesses, elements of non-knowledge and blind-spots constituting them. The shift from first-order to second-order systems theory – from observing objects and events to observing observations – harmonizes neatly with Barad's proposed shift from observing entities to asking what our material-semiotic practices make both possible and impossible. From the point of view of a language's internal organization, its 'environment' does not exist: it says all it can say.[138] However, one can also consider a language in the history of its structural ecological relations.

> Neither of these two possible descriptions is a problem per se: both are necessary to complete our understanding of a unity... The problem begins when we unknowingly go from one realm to the other and demand that the correspondences we establish between them (because we see these two realms simultaneously) be in fact a part of the operation of the unity... *If we are able to keep our logical accounting in order,* this complication vanishes; we become aware of these two perspectives and relate them in a broader realm we establish.[139]

The question is indeed one of a general economic/ecological *accounting* with the restricted ecology of a system and its blind-spot. As Wolfe explains, the blind spot is "not merely [an] ideological bias or the distortion of a pre-given reality knowable by 'science,' but rather the inevitably partial and paradoxical precondition of knowing as such."[140] Languages, like all acts of knowing and interpretation, differentially bring forth worlds, since how we are and how the world appears to us are inseparable. However, this entails that "all systems... are constituted by a necessary 'blind spot' that only *other* observing systems can see."[141] I think an imperative behind biocultural sustainability is then to preserve a diversity of observing systems. It is only in an encounter with other semiotic materializations of the environment by other languages that we can address the ecologically destructive blind-spots of our own. Translation is the structure of this encounter, and the more languages continue to disappear, the worse the chances are for the plurality of interruptions these might offer. Wolfe puts forth an ethical argument wonderfully amenable to ecosystemic translation on the basis of the contingency of all knowledge, entailing

"the necessity of the observation of others: it is only in the mutual observations of different observers that a critical view of any observed system can be formalized."[142] As I'd put it, biocultural sustainability rests precisely on keeping open the possibility of the observation of others, to let the other come and interrupt me. This could be why he argues that Derrida's most radical ecological claim is that not a single living being shares the same world. And while this separation connects us to the world,

> the very thing that makes the world available to us – the *grille* or *gramme* or *machinalité* of semiotic code or program in deconstruction, the 'blind spot' of the contingent self-reference of observation in systems theory which dictates that 'reality is what one does not perceive when one perceives it' – is also and at the same time what makes the world *unavailable* to us.[143]

Recalling Celan's *die Welt ist fort ich muss dich tragen*, "this fact – that 'the world is gone,' and not just for non-human life but also for humans, thus linking human and non-human life in their shared finitude (indeed, in the finitude of their finitude) – is precisely where ethics and ecological responsibility begin."[144]

Wolfe's central ethical point as I take it is that even if humans share the exteriority of the trace-structure of language and communication with other animals, "what they do *not* share equally is the power to materialize their misrecognition of their situation and to reproduce that materialization in institutions of exploitation and oppression whose effects are far from symmetrical in species terms."[145] The same is the case, of course, with languages; many indigenous languages according to certain ecolinguists have had disastrous effects on their relationships to their environments, but did not manifest this misrecognition on a global scale as, the argument goes, have SAE languages. What any analysis of second-order systems, and with it ecosystemic translation, must take into account, is that "some observers enjoy more resources of observation than others."[146] Here is entailed, as Wolfe cites Maturana and Varela, "an ethics we cannot evade" concerning those "*with whom we want to remain in existence*."[147] This ethics is engaged by the infinitely finite trace structure of life and all its material-semiotic enactments. Just as the system's operational closure separating it from its environment in fact connects them, Wolfe reads Derrida's notion of the retentional trace at the heart of the Living Present as its relation to its outside and exteriority in general. The trace, I showed in chapter 2, engages a relation to a past that has never been present, akin to what I called above a transcendence without contrary. It covers the entire field of life death as it does language. This is why Wolfe engages a

thought of two kinds of finitude: both the radical passivity and vulnerability we share with the living in general and that of every semiotic system.

> That second form of finitude drives from the fundamental materiality of meaning and communication itself, of any form of semiotic marking and iterability to which both human and nonhuman animals are subject in a trace structure that, as [Derrida] puts it, exceeds and encompasses the human/animal difference, and indeed 'the life/death relation' itself.[148]

Biocultural diversity might thus be understood in this structure of originary mourning, not only for the deaths of the countless species, languages and individual living beings, but also of any 'I' or 'we' in the estranging operation of language, the materiality and exteriority in which knowledge and language constitute the human and its others. As Wolfe puts it, therein lie two kinds of vulnerability and passivity.

> The first type (physical vulnerability, embodiment, and eventually mortality) is paradoxically made unavailable, *inappropriable*, to us by the very thing that makes it available – namely, a second type of 'passivity' or 'not being able,' which is the finitude we experience in our subjection to a radically ahuman technicity or mechanicity that has profound consequences, of course, for what we too hastily think of as 'our' concepts, which are therefore in an important sense not 'ours' at all.[149]

Biocultural diversity is itself structured in this dual finitude. How, then, might a posthuman, ecosystemic thought of translation help one think its sustainability?

§6.2.3: Eco-systemic Translation

Sergey Tyulenev's *Applying Luhmann to Translation Studies* allows me to build on Wolfe's deconstructive account of autopoiesis in developing my notions of translation as eco-systemic and as a material-semiotic in(ter)vention. In tracing the history of the intersections between Translation Studies and the Social Systems Theory of Luhmann, Tyulenev recalls that the need to recognize translation in a broader context than the verbal mediation from one language to another had been thoroughly developed by Roman Jakobson in his tripartite distinction between intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic translation.[150] The Polysystems theory pioneered by Itamar Even-Zohar and the Descriptive Translation Studies of Gideon Toury have themselves been the source of some controversy regarding their claims to scientific objectivity. Even-Zohar's idea of a value-neutral study of the norms through which translated literature gains its acceptability has garnered criticism – from Berman, notably – who writes that "in translation,

one cannot, one must not be neutral. Neutrality is not the corrective of dogmatism," who adds that a science of translation, if there is to be one, must break from its scientistic, positivistic and objectivist roots. (BD 63) However, Even-Zohar replies that what such criticisms abhor is not so much science itself as an imaginary, popularized account of science. Polysystems theory presents itself as a shift from a positivist collection of data to a study of relations. Furthermore, Even-Zohar is quick to distinguish his framework from the fixed and static systems of structuralism that exclude diachrony and systems-external factors. Rather, the polysystem must be understood as a dynamic open system characterized by heterogeneity and complexity. "No 'objectivist' program, in the naive sense of the word, is preached here... the study of cultural norms lies at the very core of any functional stratification theory."[151] Many laud the relativism vis-à-vis norms adopted by Even-Zohar and Toury as constituting a break with linguistics-based approaches to translation, and the theory itself for moving Translation Studies beyond Eurocentric presuppositions.[152] Nonetheless, an important gap appears to form between a descriptive account of the normative systems through which translations are produced, a first-order observation, and another relation that might read the descriptive and the normative, the constative and the performative in a much more complex relationship. Similarly, while Tyulenev identifies in the work of Theo Hermans the best application of Luhmann to Translation Studies, Hermans' own hesitation on whether or not to consider translation as a system forces him to "separate ontology and epistemology."[153] Conversely, the thought of ecosystemic translation I will develop here must refigure ontology, epistemology and ethics, the material and the semiotic as originarily entangled, not in a relation of mutual immanence, but in the general textuality or arche-writing sustained by general ecology.

Tyulenev prefers to think of translation as a subsystem of the larger social system, more precisely as what he calls a 'boundary phenomenon.' Translation both separates and connects the overall system with the environment. Whether between verbal intra- or inter-lingual transfers, or mediating between socio-cultural world-views in intercultural communication, translation is the meeting point not only between a system and its environment, but other systems in its environment: it opens the system and the environment to one another.[154] The function of translation as a boundary phenomenon "is to increase the system's environmental sensitivity."[155] Tyulenev's account of translation as a boundary phenomenon avoids many of the obstacles I've discussed in STS, Translation Studies and ecolinguistics; translation and communication are

dislodged from the notion that sees these as occurring between 'rational actors,' as well as any atomistic or individualistic account of social, and indeed ecological relations. Translation further becomes distanced from its miring in anthropocentrism; humans become mere elements in the autopoiesis of social systems. As he explains, "systemic macroparadigms are often criticized for disregarding human conscious volition... yet they have at their advantage of *better describing unintended effects of human activity*."[156] Tyulenev recalls that for Luhmann, both living and nonliving systems can be autopoietic in that they exhibit self-referential closure. Translation may thus be compared to the ears, eyes and feelers of living organisms insofar as it *mediates* between the system and its environment. But as this – assumedly non-dialectical – mediation, translation operates by observing observations rather than observing events. In this sense, translation can be held accountable for what its self-referential closure leaves out.[157]

> Translation is at the heart of the system's self-reference. Translation straddles the boundary between the system and its environment. This allows translation to manifest two contradictory facets: on the one hand, it supplies the system with options which allow the system to develop contradictions; on the other hand, translation is summoned to resolve conflicts.[158]

As Tyulenev explains, this is because translation sees both sides of what he calls the Form. Here one can recall Deleuze's distinction between exteriority and the Outside for Foucault: exteriority can be said to be the forms of 'the visible' and 'the utterable' that effectuate a cut upon the impersonal and anonymous Outside or environment. Drawing from George Spencer Brown's laws of form, form splits the world into two parts for Tyulenev: "a notion, which is the focus of our contemplation, *and all the rest*."[159] But as with organic autopoiesis, this closure and selectivity is not accidental: the boundary phenomenon of translation both unites and separates.[160] As he elaborates,

> drawing a boundary between itself and its environment is vital for the system in order to differentiate itself. An adequately determined boundary allows the system to attribute events as belonging to the inside or outside of the boundary by using its own means... the formation of the system's boundary *interrupts the continuity of the connecting process between system and environment*.[161]

In other words, ecosystemic translation binds the restricted ecology of a linguistic system to its impossible environment, the Outside. It is the stricture, the relation without relation, the *pas au-delà*, the interruptive logic by which any boundary phenomenon both enacts a cut and relates to its environment, by which this boundary transgresses, transcends itself.

To adapt Tyulenev's argument, one can never know another language, world-view, human or fungus... one can only know what is communicated in translation by applying the categories of one's own language and epistemological-ontological-ethical framework. This operation invariably selects some information as important and puts aside *everything else*. It facilitates the passage of texts from the outside in, but also fully or partially closes the system in filtering and selecting. However, the relation by which a system appropriates information from the environment, crossing its boundary in translation from the outside-in, can also operate from the inside-out. In both cases, it does not do so indiscriminately, "rather, translation always filtrates: it renders certain things and puts aside or changes other things. In the latter case, translation closes, if only partially, the system to its environment."[162] In explaining how information crosses the boundary of the system, Tyulenev distinguishes between exchange and mediation, the former a crossing without returning and the latter both a crossing and returning. Translation is a special case of such mediation: one side of the form must not only "cross the boundary and see what is out there, on the other side, but also... return to itself and juxtapose its own value and the value of the opposite side."[163] This is what allows translation to observe observations. Since its primary function is to increase environmental sensitivity, it must see both the inside and the outside of the system/environment form. "Translation, then, re-enters the form 'system/environment' in each of its mediations. In other words, each translated text (of whatever semiotic nature) reflects the relationship of the system with its environment."[164] Translation thus *shuttles* between source and target, system and environment.[165] Depending on the direction of this shuttling, Tyulenev distinguishes between experience and action.

> If the direction is from the environment into the system, that is, a meaning selection of options, provided by translation, is attributed to the environment, what happens is described as the system's experience. If the direction is from the system into the environment, then we deal with the system's action... within translation, the environment may cause the system to have an experience; within translation, the system can act on the environment.[166]

One can correlate this to what I was saying above in terms of ecosystemic translation, between *the translation of ecology*, the system acting on its environment, enacting epistemological-ontological-ethical and material-semiotic cuts, and a (restricted) *ecology of translation*, the system's experience of the environment; language and translation in their ecological contexts. System and environment mutually implicate and explicate one another in a certain restricted

ecology. What is more difficult to think here is the ecology of translation at the deeper level of arche-writing; this will disclose the outside-in of a passivity anterior to the opposition of act and experience. Translation can here be refigured as an experience of the impossible Outside, one within which it structurally and inevitably in(ter)venes ("translation 'stitches' the system and its environment") but also *tears* through this stitching, *ter*-s through in(ter)vention itself to prepare a place for the in[ ]vention of the wholly other, to let the other come.[167] If translation as mediation implies both the crossing of the boundary and a returning, one ought rather to think of this tres-pass along the logic of the *pas au-delà*, as a crossing that begins by returning.

Tyulenev again draws from Spencer Brown in identifying the law of crossing as the law of all translation; "the value of a crossing made again is not the value of a crossing... this means that if the intention is to cross a boundary and then to make another cross, the value of the two crosses put together is the value of none of them."[168] Again the strange non-dialectical negation of the *pas au-delà*. Translation, he continues, "crosses the boundary from one side to the other, yet it does not stay on the other side, it returns to the first side. Its crossing is always for recrossing. In this sense, translation presents its crossing as not crossing. Translation presents the absence of the same value of the crossings as the absence of the crossing."[169] But in this crossing, translation brings back something new; if the repetition of this return is originary, then the possibility for the event and the invention of the radically other is lodged in this very repetition.

§6.3: Translations of Ecologies, Ecologies of Translation

§6.3.1: The Translation of Ecology and the Language of Environment

In this section, I will show how the notion of translation is at play in both branches of ecolinguistics, the language of environment in §6.3.1 and the environment of language in §6.3.2. Mühlhäusler describes the reality-constructivist hypothesis of language as follows: "human beings at best see reality through a number of filters. Of these, language is the most important. Language does not describe reality, but shapes, creates, and perpetuates group-specific perceptions of reality."[170] Through their lexicons, metaphors, grammars and discourses, different languages bring different conceptions of sameness and difference into being. Mühlhäusler defines grammar as "the ecological principles which account for the fact that the whole is more than the sum of its parts."[171] This definition opposes traditional understandings of grammar as

the predictable and regular rules of phonology, morphology and syntax. Mühlhäusler draws his inspiration from Halliday, who argues that grammar is both a theory of human experience and a principle of social action, "in both these functions, or metafunctions, grammar creates the potential within which we act and enact our cultural being."[172] Halliday's theory of grammar is linked to the reality-construction view: our reality is actively constructed through language, and language evolved through and as this construction. A language's grammar both enables meaning and makes it impossible, setting limits on what can be meant.[173] In other words, Mühlhäusler writes, the lexicon provides the building blocks of a language, and grammar the instructions as to how these blocks can be arranged or rearranged. It is always possible to use the same material to build different 'spiritual homes,' but this possibility can only arise from a deep awareness and sensitivity to the nature and constraints of the lexico-grammar of our own language. Mühlhäusler and Halliday's descriptions of the co-implied possibility and impossibility of going beyond grammar are quite consonant here with what I've examined in deconstruction, complementarity and autopoiesis. To make a language foreign to itself, more 'environmentally' sensitive, in all senses of the word, by intervening within its constraints opens the possibility for new material-semiotic rearticulations and inventions, and this in(ter)vention, I argue, occurs through translation. As I mentioned, the consequence of a reality-construction hypothesis of language for Mühlhäusler is that languages are not intertranslatable. However, if we ought to seek inspiration from other languages in the interest of "transforming anthropocentric language and its metaphors of dominance, hierarchy, and boundary drawing," how can these insights be conveyed outside of translation?[174] Steiner approaches this question in *After Babel*, and despite the humanistic aspirations of this work, I feel it can contribute in an important way to fleshing out a posthumanism in the translation of ecology.

Steiner writes that "different languages are different, inherently creative counter-proposals to the constraints, to the limiting universals of biological and ecological considerations," "that is to say in the face of death."[175] The homogenizing forces of majority languages and monolingualism are suspected by the author to go hand in hand with Chomsky's theory of the universal deep structures of grammar. The argument he elaborates here is close to Mühlhäusler's. On the universalist framework, translation is invariably realizable and merely consists in locating the deep-seated universals underlying the surface dissimilarities of every language. On what Steiner calls the extreme 'monadist' framework, translation is impossible, or

rather "what passes for translation is a convention of approximate analogies, a rough-cast similitude, just tolerable when the two relevant languages or cultures are cognate, but altogether spurious when remote tongues and far-removed sensibilities are in question."[176] However, he wonders, if the Humboldt-Sapir-Whorf, or reality-construction hypothesis is correct, how is it that we can and do communicate interlingually? I think the response can be thought in terms of the invention of the other in a language's experience of the impossible. For Steiner, the invention of hypotheticals, counter-factuals and grammars of futurity constitute the origin of language. "*Language is the main instrument of man's refusal to accept the world as it is*," in other words, "to articulate possibilities beyond the treadmill of organic decay and death."[177] Given the capacity of language to articulate different materializations of the world, "each different language offers its own denial of determinism, 'the world,' it says 'can be other.'"[178] For Steiner, the death of a language is the death of a possible world, but I prefer, in adapting Derrida, that it is not only the end of *a* possible world, but the end of *the* world.[179] Steiner argues that the creative and inventive functions of language evolved from a framework of survival rather than morality.[180] For me, a concern with imagining our language otherwise in the interest of biocultural sustainability is thoroughly entangled with ethical considerations. But it is also a question of biological survival, since the destructive patterns through which we constitute our world may soon make it quite uninhabitable. If survival and ethics are no longer opposed, one can understand language as always already ethically potentialized from the first breath of its inventing the world otherwise – inventing the other – and this in a sense anterior to or beyond the human. As Harmon quotes William James, "the whole process of life is due to life's violation of our logical axioms."[181] The same is true of translation's experience of the impossible.

Both Mühlhäusler and Halliday argue that the restructuring of a SAE linguistic ecology must occur through processes of borrowing and learning from other languages and cultures. However, the former warns that the introduction of foreign concepts into a new linguistic ecology must be treated with great care if they are to endure. Thus, a critical examination of the grammatical structures and processes of SAE languages must be undertaken. Halliday challenges the "nominalizing, metaphorical grammar of late 20th Century prestige varieties of English" as becoming dysfunctionally "abstract, objectifying, and determinate," and complicit in framing the demands which have exceeded the resources of the Earth.[182] He illustrates these problems with the following four examples 1) English distinguishes between countable and uncountable

entities; 'air,' 'oil,' and 'water' are understood as 'unbounded' – existing without limits – making it difficult to conceive of these resources as finite. 2) Our grammar arranges quality and quantity together; "the grammar of 'big' is the grammar of 'good,' while the grammar of 'small' is the grammar of 'bad.' The motif of 'bigger is better' is engraved in our consciousness." 3) The transitivity of English grammar organizes human beings as the most active and agential while inanimate objects are the least. Such a construct "makes it hard for us to take seriously the notion of inanimate nature as an active participant in events." 4) Our grammar introduces a sharp dichotomy between conscious and unconscious entities that is manifested in our pronoun system. "Conscious things are *he/she* while unconscious things are *it*." This imposes a strict disjunction between us and other living beings, most notably for Halliday our relation to Gaia, the idea of the Earth as a living being popularized by Lovelock.[183]

Moreover, SAE grammar has constructed a reality that subordinates processes to objects. This occurs through the nominalization of processes into objectified entities: "a nominalized form represents qualities and processes as 'abstracted' from things and time respectively."[184] One need only consider the reification processes through which ecologically and relationally situated systems of communication are objectified into 'language,' or the processes of factories churning out greenhouse gases objectified into 'pollution,' the quantities of which can then be bought and sold. Mühlhäusler is also critical of the patterns of marking in SAE languages.[185] An example of anthropocentrism in English would be the 'unmarked' status of 'humans and animals' contrasted with the marked 'animals and humans.' Similarly, control and ownership of individuals over objects, resources and nonhuman living things is unmarked in English, in opposition to the passive construction. The marked construction sticks out as awkward and interrupts the fluency of our reading patterns. For Halliday, the at once constraining and liberating role of grammar can serve to reverse our established conceptions of linguistic marking: "redefining *growth* as *failure to shrink*" is an example of this process.[186]

However, the most important feature of linguistic structure regarding the environmental crisis might be the ways in which different languages encode temporal dimensions. Harré, Mühlhäusler and Brockheimer write that temporal concerns are not one topic among others in this respect, but are "woven into the very fabric of environmental discourse."[187] Steiner explains that "our views of time are mainly generated by the grammar of the verb... different cultures operate with and within different conceptualizations or, at the very least, different images of

time." [188] The Western understanding of the three-dimensional, past-present-future, arrow metaphor of time is organized through the Indo-European verb system. Saroj Chawla suggests that the three-dimensional conception of time "encourages a world view in which existence is perceived as fragmented rather than as holistically or relativistically interrelated."[189] This linear conception of time, the argument goes, prevents adequate considerations of futurity and is thus complicit with the wasteful here-and-now attitude of capitalist consumerism. In contrast, other time systems uphold a 'neutral or zero time preference,' "meaning that a moose in the future (or a good run of salmon) does not have lower value than a moose in the present. This is very important. A neutral or negative time preference expresses long-term values, and makes decisions different from the short-term preference for the present."[190] While SAE languages objectify and abstract nouns from subjective experience, Chawla notes the two-tense structuring of certain Amerindian systems into 'earlier' and 'later,' closer to the duration of time as subjectively experienced.[191]

Steiner points to a difference between Indo-European and Semitic constructions of temporality: future events lie before us in the former, and come after us in the latter. Furthermore, "the notion of recurrence coincides with that of duration" in Semitic time constructions.[192] This image for him coheres with the concepts of 'present absence' and 'self erasure' in deconstruction, which he deems "itself a variant on Talmudic-Kabbalistic speech speculations."[193] The incorrectness of this claim regarding deconstruction notwithstanding, let me recall from chapter 1 the unquestionable influence of Walter Benjamin on Derrida's readings of translation and survivance. Reading the two in an ecolinguistic context can be instructive here. In an attempt to preserve Sanskrit translations outside the oppositions of original and translation, Christi A. Merrill draws from Benjamin's concept of afterlife to "examin[e] the temporal constitutions of [these] narratives – beyond living to dead, past to present, plural to singular – allows us to think of these loops of rhythmatic interpretation as cyclical rather than linear."[194] In this sense, she writes, we can conceive of translation as a kind of 'justice across future births.' The concept of translation as this originary rebirth across repeating cycles of time might allow us to reconceptualise our own established frameworks of temporality and intergenerational justice. As Samuel Weber also notes regarding Benjamin, "as something that neither 'comes to be' nor 'passes away' ... the origin is an *event* involving both singularity and repetition ... what [this] entails is less a self-contained phenomenon than a complex *relationship* that is described as a

'rhythm,' thus emphasizing both its repetitive and temporal aspect."[195] This originary rhythm, he adds, is implicit in Benjamin's understanding of translation. One wonders, then, if thinking translation as rhythmically-oriented might increase its environmental sensitivity, its fidelity to the materiality of the text, its ability to listen to the lessons of traditional ecological knowledge, or TEK, in a way that resists objectification and appropriation. As Mühlhäusler notes, "the desire to live in harmony with the rhythms of nature is contradicted by a control-ful way of speaking."[196] In a sense, one can see something coming together here with respect to the end of *Life Death*, where Derrida writes that rhythm counts even more than the affirmation of life. But this is not a question of arguing that a linguistic construction more in tune with the cyclical and rhythmical processes of nature is somehow better, but rather one of interrogating this rhythm as it interrupts the linearity our own, inheriting its eternal recurrence as the grounds for selection in translation. Rhythm in ecosystemic translation would make no attempt to master time but leaves to the other its most proper time, and lets biocultural diversity live-on.

It is essential to emphasize that no theorist working on these issues partakes in an uncritical valorization of indigenous cultures and knowledge systems or deems them more in touch with 'nature,' a danger Haraway also highlights. The naive and romantic view of the 'noble savage' is rejected across the board as culturally imperialistic.[197] Mühlhäusler adds that the knowledge contained in such languages is not "necessarily better or more conducive to the long-term survival of humans than SAE languages," but that a diversity of perspectives ought to be valued in itself. "It is useful to have a number of different maps, a number of conceptual systems to serve as a corrective against particular assumptions about the world."[198] Darrell Posey notes that many indigenous languages internally embody a concept of sustainability and an ethic of conservation through a long period of adapting their language to a particular ecosystem. TEK is also said to stand in total opposition to the dualism of Western science, and to have "almost completely internalized the evolutionary give-and-take between nature and culture."[199] In this sense, Posey adds, "concepts of biodiversity and conservation are ... alien to indigenous peoples. This does not mean that they do not respect and foster living things, but rather that nature is an extension of society. Thus biodiversity is not an *object* to be conserved."[200] Luisa Maffi elaborates on this line of thought with the following:

> There is a tendency among indigenous peoples toward a holistic, non-individualist approach to the cultural as well as the natural world. A tendency to think not just in terms of parts or components, but in terms of a whole and of the relationships among the

> elements of the whole – in other words, to think ecologically in both nature and culture.[201]

However, Maffi is quite clear that "local knowledge does not easily '*translate*' into the majority languages to which minority language speakers switch."[202] In fact, dominant ethnocentric and individualistic conceptions of translation pose several problems to ethical translations of traditional ecological knowledge. For Maffi, TEK is usually the result of a communal process of creation, and thus cannot be ascribed to an original author or event. It thus facilitates colonial practices of appropriation without proper compensation to its indigenous owners. Conversely, the sacred and secret nature of some traditional knowledge resists the Western notion of public domain.[203] Many are critical of the colonial logic structuring the 'bioprospecting' of TEK in Western circles, a framework cohering with traditional understandings of the relationship between authorship and translation.[204] The frameworks of copyright law are thus as ineffective in adequately compensating TEK as they are for translations.[205] It is clear that the preservation of species and languages ought to be approached outside these appropriative frameworks: the main goal is not to "*translate* all this diversity into the one global language of science and international commerce for the benefit of those who control it."[206] However, did I not introduce and launch the notion of ecosystemic translation precisely against the technoscientific networks of global capitalism responsible for environmental destruction? The central issue here, as another researcher puts it, is that indigenous knowledge be "understood, respected, and synthesized with global knowledge in a balanced, humane way."[207]

This synthesis is admittedly non-dialectical and the site of an interminable negotiation. Posey suggests that our ultimate goal should be to "harness the totality, rather than the components, of TEK systems in sustainability strategies, so that the quality of indigenous management can benefit the wider society."[208] In fact, Harré, Mühlhäusler and Brockheimer warn that it is problematic to selectively ransack particular insights from traditional knowledge systems. Since linguistic concepts develop over a long period of interaction with their environment, Mühlhäusler cautions that borrowing from the vast pool of indigenous knowledge cannot consist of the simple transfer and addition of single elements, but must constitute "the reconstruction of a linguistic ecology," translation being precisely the cut that allows for this rearticulation.[209] Maffi adds that the real task is thus that "indigenous heritage be protected as *bodies* – bodies of knowledge, bodies of folklore, bodies of language – and as *living*, constantly

developing bodies, not as dead bodies from the past."[210] As Posey points out, the oral character and communal creation of much TEK is what allows it to maintain itself as a living process, as "holistic, inherently dynamic, constantly evolving through experimentation and innovation, fresh insight, and external stimuli."[211] Especially in oral cultures, Cronin explains, "material is constantly modified as part of the dynamic relationships that exist between the tellers of the tales and their audiences."[212] It is in this sense that Maffi evokes the necessity of protecting a right to orality if TEK is to be preserved as a process and as a living body.

Translation, I've argued, engages precisely such a living-on in its concern for materiality, but of course no living-on is possible without mourning. These aporetics of translation structure everything at stake in ecolinguistics, and only a "case-by-case examination – within the framework of an evolved, hybrid, integrated flexible system for the protection of indigenous peoples' rights – may lead to an appropriate system solution."[213] Such is the task of the *ecology of translation*; to assess the context – ecological, sociopolitical, linguistic – for the *translation of ecology*.

§6.3.2: The Ecology of Translation and the Environment of Language

Insofar as Translation Studies and ecolinguistics have recognized the need for a shift from an objectivist study of fixed, static, discrete and individual entities to a situated intervention within fields of relations processes, networks and open systems with emergent, conflictual and contradictory properties, one can see that the protection of biocultural diversity must concern itself more with sustaining the ecological support systems through which life emerges rather than any individual notion of 'life itself.' However, more needs to be said about what constitutes such contexts of life for biocultural diversity, and what kinds of obligations we have towards its sustainability.

Harmon argues that the destruction of biological and cultural diversity represents the destruction of "the fundamental processes that generated the conditions of life that we ('we' meaning all species) are at home in."[214] These conditions of life are what he understands as the biocultural presence, "nothing less than the entire complement of biological and cultural diversity now existing, bestowed upon the Earth by millions of years of evolution."[215] I argued above that our ethical stance towards preserving this biocultural presence is best directed towards sustaining the formative processes of ecosystemic speciation. Our interventions, Harmon

suggests, would do well to "mimic these patterns in nature."[216] For Bang and Døør, an ecological point of view necessitates an attempt to understand other cultures and species, and my argument here is, again, that the aporetics of this understanding can be expressed through those of translation.[217] As I'll show, however, to do so involves an apprehension of the conflictual and contradictory dynamics through which ecosystems flourish. Steffensen points out that the goal of ecological linguistics is thus not to stand outside a conflictual structure, but to emphasize a notion of "impermanent harmony in conflict."[218] Embracing diversity for Harmon entails an appreciation of conflicting values "as part of a larger ethical landscape whose overall diversity should be preserved."[219] One finds similar arguments in one author's adaptation of Bateson's theory of metacommunication in formulating their approach to translation; "the condition for a successful relationship between... interactants is not their similarity but the mutual recognition of difference."[220] Likewise, physicist Fritjof Capra explains that "ecological literacy includes that both sides of a conflict can be important, depending on the context, and the contradictions within a community are signs of its diversity and vitality, and thus contribute to the system's viability."[221]

Cronin defines translation ecology as "a translation practice that gives control to speakers and translators of minority languages of what, when and – perhaps more urgently... how texts might be translated in and out of their languages."[222] One of the ends of refiguring translation as 'transmissive' rather than 'communicative' is its contribution to biocultural diversity.[223] Translation relationships need to be constantly reassessed since the conflictual and asymmetrical dynamics of hegemony between languages are constantly in states of flux. "Moving away from foundational notions of translation, it will be in a conception of translation as 'a world of continued relational adjustments' that minority languages will finally have a role to play in the discipline of Translation Studies."[224] Communities attempting to preserve minority languages find themselves in a double bind regarding translation. Cronin argues that Venuti's famous ethical framework of foreignizing or minoritizing translation can in fact be counterproductive in translating from a major language. But what is foreignization, and how do its relations with domestication conflict in translation ecology?

For Berman, I showed, a logic of the same has more often than not hijacked the true ethical aim of translation; to receive the other as other within one's language. However, Venuti supplements an originary violence to this Levinasian framework.

> [there is a] violence that resides in the very activity of translation: the reconstruction of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs, and representations that pre-exist it in the target language, always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality... The aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar, and this aim always risks a wholesale domination of the foreign text.[225]

For Venuti, translation can never rid itself of this fundamental ethnocentrism. However, it can limit its violence through the work of foreignization, which challenges the hegemony of the major, target language by interrupting the fluency of its readability in the target text; a foreignized translation *looks* and *reads* like a translation. "Foreignizing translation signifies the difference of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language. In its effort to do right abroad, this translation must do wrong at home, deviating enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience."[226] Foreignizing or minoritizing translation operates through what he calls the 'remainder,' the variables of non-standard forms of language (dialects, for example) that reveal a language's self-heterogeneity and interrupt its hegemony. Since English is by far the language the most translated from and yet very little translated into, foreignizing translation into English can serve to challenge "ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism," and I'd add anthropocentrism here, too.[227]

But for Cronin, revealing the self-heterogeneity of a minority language can in fact place this language in greater danger of extinction. Conversely,

> a domesticating strategy which is perceived as regressive, ethnocentric, and appropriative in the case of a major language does not necessarily carry the same meanings for minority languages. In the context of minority language[s], naturalizing strategies can indeed preserve rather than endanger the planet's linguistic ecosystem.[228]

In other words, the need for a certain restricted ecology of openness and closure must be taken into account in formulating the general ecology of ecosystemic translation. It may even be necessary for ecosystemic translation to contextually and strategically allow for a restricted, static conception, even objectification of language where the conditions of life simply cannot be met, notably in such situations of extreme asymmetry where translation from major to minor languages threaten the survival of the latter. In other words, an understanding of language-in-its-environment can necessitate the deployment of a fictional or metaphorical 'language-in-itself.' In the case of protecting biodiversity, this would be analogous to protecting an individual species rather than its ecological conditions in extremely dire cases. Similarly, it would contextually deploy a thinking of similarities with other living beings rather than the ethics of difference I've

argued for throughout. Derrida sees Nietzsche as anticipating something similar; the strong are those who impose their language, either upon someone who does not speak it, or impose a manner of speaking within a language itself. This is force itself, Derrida writes, "and since there is no language without hierarchies, laws, rules, normativity, or grammar, there is no language without force of law and therefore without an imposition of the colonial type." (LV 45*t*) And even if this force can always invert itself into a weakness, powerlessness and passivity, Derrida notes that sometimes humans are worth saving more than their languages. "Today, on this earth of humans, certain people must yield to the homo-hegemony of dominant language. They must learn the language of the masters, of capital and machines; they must lose their idiom in order to survive or live better. A tragic economy, an impossible counsel." (MAP 56/30)

An apprehension of the context of the minor language in question is paramount in Cronin's translation ecology, "attach[ing] due importance to particularism and place, without a reactionary retreat to ethnocentric smugness."[229] As such, Cronin follows Latour in explains the network as a new paradigm of translation.

> A network is by definition open ended and therefore capable of being extended indefinitely... as a result, new elements can lead to restructuring without collapse. Secondly... the potential openness of the network does not mean it is open to all... Thirdly, the logic of the network is greater than the power of its individual nodes... in other words, the connectedness of nodes is what permits their flexible and dynamic response to changing situations but it is shared goals, values, and ends which allow for a level of structural coherence in the network itself.[230]

Countless papers in environmental ethics, Translation Studies and Science and Technology Studies have become mired in a difficult debate on striking the right balance between universalism and particularism, care and rights, holism and individualism, perhaps more recently resurrected between processes and objects. In chapter 5, I followed Derrida and Esposito in arguing that the language of individual human rights evolved from the political philosophies of traditional liberalism. It can therefore be closely correlated with the attitude that individual species and languages ought to be protected rather than the ecological processes and relations that bring these about and sustain them. However, as James A. Nash puts it, a comprehensive ethic of bioresponsibility involves considerations of both individualistic and holistic poles, individual life-forms and ecosystemic wholes as complementary.[231] Tove Skutnabb-Kangas presents an account of linguistic rights that does not neatly fit into the universal/particular, care/rights binaries. As she argues, linguistic human rights, particularly in education, "play a

decisive role in maintaining and revitalizing languages and in supporting linguistic and cultural diversity and through them, also biological diversity on Earth."[232] Human rights themselves must be understood as the rights of future generations to biocultural diversity.[233] While most human rights are framed in terms of individual persons, linguistic human rights are also collective, and as such constitute "essential tools through which minorities can get access to those rights majorities are granted through individual rights."[234] The UN's focus on individual rights has been to the detriment of minority groups and has contributed to the invisibility of the plight of endangered languages for Skutnabb-Kangas.[235] She also claims that human rights become completely insufficient in the face of asymmetrical power relations; "human rights approaches are naive if they disregard power relations – and many of them do. Some of them are themselves well on their way to rather becoming part of the oppressive system rather than a solution... Linguistic human rights are true and beautiful, but futile in a negotiated situation of unequal power."[236] This concern is echoed by Maffi, who wonders whether the Western discourse of rights is really the best option in the preservation of biocultural diversity, rather than understanding sustainability in terms of "obligations of the human community to earth and the other species on it."[237] One finds another similar argument in the dialectical linguistics of Bang and Døør, who distinguish between what they call the 'rights universe of discourse,' framed in terms of 'right-duty-obligation justice,' and a 'love discourse,' characterized by "love, peace, wisdom, compassion, friendship, co-joy, sharing, caring, and natural harmony."[238] And if this seems to clash a little too optimistically with the notions of interruption and resistance I've been developing here, the authors flesh it out in relation to a further distinction in their work between vital and essential needs; "instead of the concept of 'vital needs' we can work with a distinction between *vital needs* which concern survival, and *essential needs* which are about living and blossoming."[239] General ecology accounts for both a restricted ecology of survival, a delay and deferral of death [vital needs] and the absolute element of non-knowledge, the impossible event of the other; and in this repetition prepares a place to let the other come, blossom, flourish and die at its own rhythm. Restricted and general ecology are precisely complementary in this sense: considerations of preserving biocultural diversity ought wherever possible to be concerned with preparing the conditions to let life live, effloresce and die. But when the ecological, political and cultural asymmetries are such that providing these conditions – however well intentioned – is

impossible, attention may be directed to an urgent life-or-death battle for the survival of the organic or inorganic life in question.

§6.4: Foreignizing the Human Geschlecht

To think translation as a material-semiotic in(ter)vention and the role I see it playing in biocultural sustainability, I began by contrasting Derrida's notion of life death as general text with Foucault's notion of the pre-modern 'textualization' of Nature where words and things were not yet split apart. General text is the consequence of thinking life in its originary repetition, re-production and translation, and this applies to science, language, biopolitics and any other epistemological-ontological-ethical framework. The *other* translation Berman sees dissimulated in every 'restricted' translation corresponds to a transcendence, one that opens onto the infinite inappropriability of the other, manifesting the manifestation of a singularity that is each time uniquely the birth and death of the world, whether a species, culture or language, a carp, seaweed or a bee. The materiality of the other, of the world itself is both what resists and paradoxically calls for translation. In fact, as Berman draws from Benjamin, it is the very corporeality of the work "that makes it alive and able to survive." (BT 25) As a material-discursive in(ter)vention, translation re-orders the entanglement of matter and meaning, and must be accountable for the resulting cuts. But these cuts are never made once and for all, and remain indefinitely open for and to their more ethical reiteration. The general text of biocultural diversity is nothing other than this reading and writing of itself along these lines, and translation passes no more through two self-identical languages than does communication pass between two individual human interlocutors; both notions thus require rethinking. What Latour calls the world of translation "does not start from human beings, those latecomers, nor from language, a more recent arrival still."[240]

As I'd shown in chapter 1, Benjamin's interest in the sacred text in translation rests precisely on the inextricability of its letter and its sense, and I'd extended this not only to every literary and poetic text, but to every material-semiotic event in the arche-writing of general ecology. The sacred, as Henri Meschonnic puts it, is "the fusional of human and cosmic, including animal. Hence the sacred is anterior to human language."[241] Berman's notion of translation as experience and transcendence led him to posit the secret passages between life and death at play in the other notion of translation, what Derrida follows Bataille and Blanchot in

thinking as a *pas de sens*, where experience is an authority that expiates itself. Benjamin's concern with the life and afterlife of works was read by some to introduce an originary dimension of repetition and cyclical, rhythmic temporality at the heart of any translation. For Weber, translatability must thus be expressed as a relational concept, "and relations, Benjamin warns, should not necessarily be judged in exclusively human terms, such as the needs of human beings to understand works written in a foreign language."[242] This is perhaps why translation's primary aim for Benjamin is not to communicate but rather to promise a reconciliation and kinship among languages, a language to come that ought be distinguished from any teleological utopianism. As I mentioned above, Cronin suggests that the shift from thinking translation as transmissive rather than communicative has as its aim the fostering of genuine biocultural diversity on earth.[243] Listening to the rhythms of life death of biological, cultural and linguistic diversity on earth – without any attempt to master or control these – is the very task of ecosystemic translation. In the *oikos* of general ecology, "what counts is less the *telos* than the rhythm of différance and the speed of the step [*pas*]" (CP /361) ... "what counts in the final accounting is beyond the account, it is a certain *pas au-delà*." (OA 32/19*t*)

In my discussion of ecosystemic translation, I'd emphasized translation as a boundary phenomenon in its crossing *for* re-turning in Tyulenev's analysis. To think translation as, in a sense, this originary re-crossing from the impossible environment or Outside of the form, from its underside, spoke to me precisely in the syntax of the *pas au-delà*. The fact that translation observes observations rather than observing events makes it accountable for a system's blind-spots while increasing its environmental sensitivity, in all senses of the words.

> Translation 'stitches' the system and its environment,... which makes a full foreignization in verbal translation impossible. But, since translation unites the sides of the form by demonstrating their distinguishability, a full domestication is rendered equally impossible. Any translation is neither or both. It is a matter of degrees... In any case, translation supplies options for enriching the system's meaning horizon and thereby, to this or that degree, challenges and influences the dominant discourse.[244]

Certainly, I mentioned above, a certain restricted economy of openness and closure, foreignization and domestication is at stake in any translation ecology. However, foreignization for Venuti involves a different kind of subjectivity than that grounding the opposition between author and translator, original and translation at stake in the humanist aspirations of domestication. "Neither the foreign writer nor the translator is conceived as the transcendental

origin of the text... Rather, subjectivity is constituted by cultural and social determinants that are diverse and even conflicting, that mediate any language use, and that vary with every cultural formatting and every historical moment."[245] If foreignization can challenge ethnocentrism and racism in a major language, can it in a sense serve to make the human foreign to itself, to interrupt the mechanisms through which we make the degradation of biocultural diversity ungrievable? This would be the *task*, as I take up my epigraph from Nietzsche, of translating humanity back into nature, without any assured knowledge, precisely in the *pas de sens*, nonknowledge and im-possibility onto which general ecology opens. It is a precisely posthumanist task, which Wolfe elegantly summarizes as follows:

> Posthumanism can be defined quite specifically as the necessity for any discourse or critical procedure to take account of the constitutive (*and* constitutively paradoxical) nature of its own distinctions, forms, and procedures... That can only be done, as we have seen, by another observer, using a different set of distinctions – and that observer, within the general economy of autopoiesis and iterability, need not be human (indeed, from this vantage, never was 'human').[246]

The promise of the reconciliation of languages Benjamin reads in translation, and what I introduced in chapter 1 as Derrida's posthuman promise of the earth, might then be thought together as the promise of biocultural life death on earth. In chapters 1-3, I'd outlined the temporalities Derrida found incapable of thinking this promise; the death drive, the living present, and the auto-affection of time, all of which remained too bound to an ecology of propriety, immanence, self-presence, the teleology of science and history, the proper of the human, its powers, capacities and forces. The Eternal Return however is precisely an unpower, expressing the detour of all thought for Blanchot and the ruin of our attempts to dominate the earth. The condition for the promise of biocultural sustainability to be affirmed is precisely this detour of thought that passes originarily through the other. As an originary form of return, the *pas* of ecosystemic translation, *translation* itself and all other movements in *tr-* begin by returning. And this is how ecosystemic translation can listen to the rhythms of the earth (which are anything but calculable) with no attempt to master them or to *keep time* with them.

In the foreword to a recent anthology on non-Western concepts of translation, Ganesh Devy writes that "if the earth is to be saved from the ecological ravishment that it has been repeatedly encountering all over, words, texts, and cultures must return to nomadism, must get translated forever."[247] Translation, however, may in a sense have never been anything other than

nature's own denaturing of itself; a history of trans-lational spaces, Berman writes, would have to rest on "a *history of migrations*, and a 'theory' of the human being as *migrant-being* (migration is the foundation of translation) and, furthermore, *mutant-being* (all migration is mutation)." (BD 56) Such an understanding would wholly overflow the very logic of translation as anti-natural: "assimilation of translation to the absurd imitation of human language by parrots, to the infra-human verbiage of monkeys... In truth, we still lack an anthology [*florilège*] of translation metaphors; this anthology would teach us more on the act of translating than many specialized treatises." (BT 45) Indeed, beyond even these animal metaphors, as Michael Marder recalls the etymology of 'florilège' or anthology, "'a collection of flowers' (from Greek *anthos*, 'flower' + *logos*, derived from *legein*, 'to gather')."[248] But a gathering that, along the logic of general ecology, would find itself ex-propriated across the field of the living, undoing and reinscribing the oppositions between the human and its others, the organic and the inorganic, species and languages, to think life death on earth with others more justly.

Seven: In-conclusion

How does one conclude a project that has attempted at every turn to resist any process of completion, stressed the necessity of open-endedness as a condition of living-on? The question is itself somewhat problematic, as nothing lives-on without being cut from its source, and as painful as this cutting is at the moment, this quasi machine-like cut alone assures the possibility of this work's survival. The structure of general ecology itself ex-propriates this work from me, and the mechanical cut

> *at the same time detaches from and reattaches to* the family (*heimisch*, homely), to the familiar, to the domestic, to the proper, to the *oikos* of the ecological and of the economic, to the *ethos*, to the place of dwelling... at the same time ex-propriates and re-appropriates, de-racinates and re-enracinates, *ex-appropriates*. (FS 78/64)

This ex-propriation is itself the condition for its new articulations, the work's rearticulation into new contexts, new ecologies, new translations, new readers. And I hesitate with every word I type as I know, with this section concluded, that *General Ecology: Life Death on Earth in Derrida and Others* will no longer belong to me, and if it ever did, it was at least never mine to keep, and I anticipate as much an ecstatic, affirmative gaiety as I do a nauseating postpartum depression. Or elsewhere along the time of life, I feel as if my kid is going off to college, leaving the family dwelling, off to make her own way in the world, leaving me to the retirement projects I'd put off in raising her.

What new contexts will general ecology articulate itself in? Of course, I've come at everything here as what might be called a Derridean, and as a-perspectival as the abyss hollowing out its point of view may be, deconstruction demands, or rather necessitates a certain reading, certain theoretico-practical frameworks, certain openings. I'd be delighted and terrified to see how this gaze-less gaze looks when mirrored from the other side; what would a Husserlian or Heideggerian, a Deleuzian or Foucauldian, a Blanchotian or Bataillian think in reading these pages? Or even further, a biopolitical theorist, someone working in STS, a Translation Studies scholar or an ecolinguist, an environmental activist? I expect to get a glimpse of this at the defence a few short weeks. For now, I'd like to propose certain possible future directions for general ecology.

First of all, I think reading the insights of general ecology in close conversation with other strains in environmental ethics and environmental philosophy proper would provide for some important and timely work, and not only for the fact that the biocultural paradigm is not

often addressed in these fields of study. The phenomenological notions of the flesh and the body are ones where my discussions of materiality, particularly in chapter 2, would find an interesting new articulation. Husserl's *Ideas II* on the constitution of material, animal and spiritual nature would be a great place to start, as would Derrida's reading of this text in *On Touching*, as well as the reading he proposes therein of Merleau-Ponty.[1] The work of Jean-Luc Nancy himself, particularly as concerns ecotechnics, would be a fruitful new context within which general ecology can deploy itself. With respect to Heidegger, it would be interesting to read some of the texts Derrida himself does not cover, particularly the *Beiträge* and the related *Mindfulness* and *The History of Beyng* and see how these fit in to the difficult investigations I've put forth here.[2] I'd also be curious to see what an eco-deconstructive reading of the work of Max Scheler looks like, a philosopher once counted among the top three phenomenologists (along with Husserl and Heidegger), but rarely heard from today. To bring many of the propositions of this dissertation into a closer engagement with the work of Simondon would be fascinating as well, especially given his recent surge in popularity. I also wonder how Deleuze's work, which itself does not often talk about ecology proper, both lines up with and separates itself from Guattari's ecosophy, not only in *The Three Ecologies* but in the massive, recently published *Qu'est-ce que l'écosophie*?[3] I wonder if what I developed in my chapter on biopolitics will find itself better received by those interested in problematizing affirmative biopolitics, or by those of the Agamben-ian persuasion, and it will be very interesting to me to see what kinds of conversations develop there. I'm also excited to see how these ideas get picked up or engaged in other posthumanist discourses such as new materialism, new vitalism, process philosophy and particularly the more ecologically oriented aspects of object-oriented philosophy. Although I haven't been particularly taken by ooo, and for what I feel are important reasons, I don't want to foreclose a deeper engagement with something because it's new, trendy or controversial. I can think of so many smart academics I know who never bothered reading Derrida due to the caricatures of his thought that often circulate, and have always found this most unfortunate for them.

Speaking of Derrida, general ecology will be able to further graft itself into new contexts for a long time to come given the wealth of unpublished material still being edited and translated. As I write this, I've returned from a translation workshop on his 1975-6 seminar *Theory and Practice* (on Althusser, Gramsci and Heidegger – particularly on the latter's "Letter on

Humanism" and "The Question Concerning Technology"). So many of the questions brought up in this dissertation find important complementary expressions therein, ones that challenge the injunction to put general ecological theory into practice and think the two as bound up much more closely. I've had the chance to study the 10 unpublished sessions of *Given Time* (1978-9), the first two years of *La Chose*: Heidegger/Ponge (1975-6), Heidegger/Blanchot (1976-7), as well as discovering a fall 1977 seminar *La Chose 3*, "La Voie de la langue" on Blanchot exclusively, and am already thinking of working these and the other trajectories outlined above into *General Ecology Volume II*. One could also engage Derrida's earlier seminars on Husserl and Bergson, the two years of seminars following *The Politics of Friendship* (*Rhetorics of Cannibalism* and *Eating the Other*). All these seminars and countless more will provide so many opportunities to rethink and rearticulate the claims and stakes of general ecology, its living-on through the Derridean corpus and beyond. And for this, I feel nothing but excitement.

Finally, what will mean the most to me is to hear from the readers of this text, the others I share life death on earth with. Given that general ecology both stresses a responsibility in the deployment of programs of action, by way of norms and rules, and a responsibility before the incalculable invention of the other, I wonder what programs and events the others reading and rewriting this text will invent for themselves in responding to the loss of biocultural diversity. If this text of differences is to make a difference, or let a difference come about, this is what would give me the most joy, not in economically reimbursing me for years of work, but in aneconomically exceeding any expectation of where I might have seen this text going.

July, 2016.

Notes

Notes to Epigraph

[1] The notes to the poem also provide an earlier version that reads "La mort saisit le vif/ et l'oiseau/ ferme la marche." (OC 4 360/n.a.) Note the change from the earlier 'la mort' (death) to 'le mort' (the dead [one]). Translated in English as "The Earth": "The dead man/ catches the quick/ and the bird brings up the rear." I'd prefer "The dead/ seizes (or grips, takes hold of) the living" in anticipating the life death on earth at stake here. Translating "ferme la marche" is more difficult; "brings up the rear" is certainly adequate, as would be "comes in last place." But with all the talk of the paths, *Wege* and steps to follow, I'd also like to hear in this '*marche*' the ambiguity of a '*pas*,' in the double syntax of Maurice Blanchot's '*pas au-delà*,' both the step beyond and its negation. In the September 2nd defence of this dissertation, I mentioned that this poem would be the last addition to this dissertation, a grafting that would 'ferme le pas,' but would also plead 'ferme-le pas!' 'don't close it!,' a final, but ultimately futile epigrafting so that the work might live on just a little longer. Montréal, September 14, 2016.

Notes to Introduction

[1] E. Chivian and A. Bernstein (eds.) *Sustaining life: How human health depends on biodiversity* (New York, Oxford University Press, 2008).

[2] Holly Dublin, "Endangered Species" *Encyclopaedia Britannica.* (2015), http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/186738/endangered.species. Cf. also "The Extinction Crisis," *The Center for Biological Diversity.* http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/programs/biodiversity/elements_of_biodiversity/extinction_crisis/

[3] Richard Monastersky, "Biodiversity: Life -– a status report," *Nature* (2014), http://www.nature.com/news/biodiversity-life-a-status-report-1.16523.

[4] Lee Sweetlove, "Number of species on Earth tagged at 8.7 million," *Nature* (2011), http://www.nature.com/news/2011/110823/full/news.2011.498.html.

[5] "Indiana University researchers find Earth may be home to 1 trillion species," *IU Bloomington Newsroom* (2016), http://news.indiana.edu/releases/iu/2016/05/microorganism-study.shtml.

[6] Michael E. Krauss, "The World's Languages in Crisis," *Language* 68, no. 1 (1992): 4-10. See also Karin Wiecha, "New Estimates on the Rate of Global Language Loss," *The Rosetta Project*, http://rosettaproject.org/blog/02013/mar/28/new-estimates-on-rate-of-language-loss/.

[7] Russ Rymer, "Vanishing Voices," *National Geographic* (2012), http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2012/07/vanishing-languages/rymer-text.

[8] http://www.sil.org/ethnologue

[9] Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Luisa Maffi and David Harmon, *Sharing a World of Difference: The Earth's Linguistic, Cultural and Biological Diversity* (Paris, UNESCO, 2003), 22.

[10] Ibid., 20.

[11] Luisa Maffi, "Linguistic, Cultural, and Biological Diversity," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34 (2005): 602.

[12] Cf. the July 15, 2016 article in *Science*, Tim Newbold et. al. "Has land use pushed terrestrial biodiversity beyond the planetary boundary? A global assessment." *Science* 353, no. 6296 (2016): 288-291.

[13] in *Ecospirit: Religions and Philosophies for the Earth*, Laurel Kearns and Catherine Keller, eds. (New York, Fordham University Press, 2007), 264-287.

[14] See in the latter my "Is it Ecologically Just to Be? Antinatalism in Eco-Deconstruction" *Oxford Literary Review* 38, no. 1 (2016): 99-126.

[15] Readers interested in a closer engagement of both are encouraged to read Matthias Fritsch's "An Eco-Deconstructive Account of the Emergence of Normativity in 'Nature,' in *Eco-Deconstruction: Derrida and Environmental Philosophy* eds. Matthias Fritsch, Philippe Lynes and David Wood, currently under review by Fordham University Press, and also the editors' introduction to the volume.

[16] Timothy Morton independently posits a 'general ecology' in his *Ecology Without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2007), 109. Morton has also explored the relations between deconstruction and ecology on several points, and has been immensely influential in bringing ecological thought to a wider public. The notion of 'general ecology' is not, however, developed by Morton therein, and I'm not sure that, given my reservations with respect to object oriented ontology, it would correspond very closely to what I'll be developing here. I reserve a deeper engagement of a debate between eco-deconstruction and OOO, as well as a closer reading of Morton's work, for another project.

Notes to chapter one: Survivance and General Ecology

[1] For more on the 'affirmative turn to life,' see Cary Wolfe's reading of Claire Colebrook and Roberto Esposito in *Before the Law: Humans and Animals in a Biopolitical Frame* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2013), 63.

[2] I will develop this at length in my studies of Deleuze, Foucault and Esposito in chapters 4 and 5, particularly with respect to the notion of double death these thinkers all draw from Blanchot.

[3] On originary survivance, see AVE, 26/26. For deconstruction as an experience of the impossible, see P1, 27/15.

[4] Différance, as he will put it in *Positions*, is "*the* concept of economy, and since there is no economy without différance, it is the most general structure of economy, given that one understands by economy something other than the classical economy of metaphysics or the classical metaphysics of economy." (PE 17/8*t*)

[5] CP, 373/352.

[6] AS, 173/126.

[7] Iterability for Derrida designates "the space of the *alteration* of the originary *iteration* (*iterum*, anew, does it not come from the Sanskrit *itara*, other?); of repetition, reproduction, representation; or also in space as the possibility of iteration and the exit from life placed outside itself." (DG 297-8/209) "This iterability (*iter*, once again, comes from *itara*, *other* in Sanskrit, and everything that follows may be read as the exploitation of the logic which links repetition to alterity." (MP 375/315)

[8] Derrida specifies that an event ought above all happen to a living being that experiences it, but it is the automatic, inorganic and dead repetition of the machine that opens the possibility for the inscription of the event onto organic matter. Such is, Derrida writes, the im-possible figure of the event-machine, which is to say the only possible event. WA, 72-3.

[9] In ED, 293-340/246-291.

[10] "To Speculate: On 'Freud'" in CP, 275-438/257-410. I will return to Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche at length in chapter 4.

[11] As Laplanche and Pontalis define these terms, the pleasure principle is "one of the two principles which, according to Freud, govern mental functioning: the whole of physical activity is aimed at avoiding unpleasure and procuring pleasure. Inasmuch as unpleasure is related to the increase of quantities of excitation, and pleasure to their reduction, the principle in question may be said to be an economic one." ... The reality principle, for its part is "coupled with the pleasure principle, which it modifies: insofar as it succeeds in establishing its dominance as a regulatory principle, the search for satisfaction does not take the most direct routes but instead makes detours and postpones the attainment of its goal according the conditions imposed by the outside world." J. Laplanche et J.-B. Pontalis, *Vocabulaire de la psychanalyse* (Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1976); trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith as *Language of Psycho-Analysis* (London, Karnac Books, 1988), 332/322, 336/379. One could, anticipating my discussions of double affirmation in chapter 4, say that a second yes guards against the unconditional affirmation of the first. As with Freud's conservation drive, which comes to economically limit the unconditional affirmation of the pleasure principle, Jacob structures the reproductive logic of the living as something originarily selective. An economy of dissemination operates in the tension between the forces at play in the solidary logics of reproduction and selection. In a genetic mutation, Derrida writes, "the self-relation of auto-affection is the general form of what comes to limit the gap or the mutation by giving it in that same stroke the chance to breathe." (L4, 13*t*) Life must be on the one hand open enough to "integrate the newness of programs, which must be sufficiently new, disseminating to ensure the maximum of propagation, but also sufficiently near to itself and repetitive so that dissemination is not a pure dissemination, that is to say a loss without return into the unique." (L4, 13*t*)

[12] MP, 19/18.

[13] ED, 302/203. As Derrida will say, *la vie la mort* is neither la vie *est* la mort (life is death) nor la vie *et* la mort (life and death)

[14] CP, 338/317.

[15] BS2, 365/264.

[16] "Does not everything that Freud ventures on the subject of time in these environs [*parages*] have to be related to the auto-affective structure of time (that which there gives itself to receive is no present-being) such as it is described in Husserl's *Lectures on Internal Time Consciousness* or Heidegger's *Kantbuch*?" (CP 382/359) Derrida indicates in a note that this will be explored in a later publication, *Given Time*, although these arguments will not in fact appear in the published version. *Given Time* constitutes the first five sessions of a seminar given in 1978-9, and again in 1991. Derrida only compares Husserl and Heidegger's temporalizations in the 13th session, and I reserve an analysis of this for another project. As Derrida writes in "Freud and the Scene of Writing," Freud's concept of *Nachträglichkeit*, [deferred action] is irreducible to both Husserlian and Heideggerian temporalization and their concepts of world; the present is not originary but constituted, there is no purity of the Living Present in Freud's

account. (ED 134/266) In "Différance," he adds that the structure of *nacthräglichkeit* "forbids that one make of temporalization (temporization) a simple dialectical complication of the living present as an originary and unceasing synthesis." (MP 21/21) Death, he writes, "is bound to life and to the living present which it repeats originarily." (ED 336/286) In referring to the trace of a past that has never been present, the trace, arche-writing, "erases the transcendental difference between the origin of the world and being-in-the-world. Erases it in producing it: medium of the dialogue and of the misunderstanding in the Husserlian and Heideggerian concepts of being-in-the-world." (ED 315/267)

[17] Derrida anticipates the dramatis personae of the *La Vie la mort* seminar in *Of Grammatology* writing on the trace "as it appears in both Nietzschean and Freudian discourse. And finally, in all scientific fields, notably in biology." (DG 103/70) One ought to recall that the originary technicity of arche-writing Derrida speaks of in the introduction to this text ought to be understood "in this sense that the biologists speaks today of writing and the *pro-gram* with respect to the most elementary processes of information in the living cell... Even before being determined as human... or nonhuman, the *grammè* – or the *grapheme* – would name the element." (DG 19/9) Jacob's own introduction to *The Logic of Life* is entitled 'programme,' which is also the title of Derrida's first lecture in *La Vie la mort*.

[18] This move is also hinted at by Canguilhem, and would become very important to Foucault. See also Leonard Lawlor's *Implications of Immanence: Toward a New Concept of Life* (New York, Fordham University Press, 2006).

[19] "The essence itself, the proper of the living, livingness [*vivance*] itself, its *ousia* and its *aitia*, its being alive, its essence-existence, the moving and final cause, the becoming final of the moving cause." (L4, 10*t*) I will show Derrida challenge this Aritotelico-Heglianism of biology in his discussion of Canguilhem as well. In citing from *La Vie la mort*, the first number refers to the session, while the second corresponds to the page number from Derrida's typescript.

[20] One could develop here a comparison between the notion of free and bound energies in the detour between the economic principles of the pleasure and reality principles in Freud.

[21] L5, 13.

[22] The machine, Derrida writes, is both dead and death itself, "not because we risk death in playing with machines, but because the origin of machines is the relation to death." (ED 335/285)

[23] "The –itself [*le se*-] erases in a way the difference between producing and reproducing. In *self*-reproduction [le *se*-reproduire] neither the *self* [*le* se-] nor the *re* supervenes upon a producing that would precede them, a product that would pre-exist them." (L5, 2*t*)

[24] Bataille, I'll show in §1.2.1, argues something similar.

[25] Derrida suggests that the belief in the value of the immanence and appropriability of death to life in Freud's death drive, as well as Heidegger's being-towards-death, may been nothing other than a consolation before the constitutive ex-propriation of the transcendence of death. I will have the chance to discuss Heidegger's thought of death at length in chapter 3.

[26] This is perhaps how one might read Derrida when he says that "the *exappropriating* structure is irreducible and undecomposable... it always prevents reappropriation from closing in on itself or achieving itself in a circle, the economic circle or the family circle. No progress, no progressivity of man." (CP 385/362) As impossible to think as the différance between restricted economy and the expenditure without reserve will be the structure bringing together this repetition of the mechanical with the organic, living, singular event. The mechanical, in this sense, "*at the same time detaches from and reattaches to* the family (*heimisch*, homely), to the familiar, to the domestic, to the proper, to the *oikos* of the ecological and of the economic, to the *ethos*, to the place of dwelling... at the same time ex-propriates and re-appropriates, de-racinates and re-enracinates, *ex-appropriates*." (FS 78/64)

[27] On the monstrosity of the event-machine, see WA, 73, and §1.3 below.

[28] David Wills, *Inanimation: Theories of Inorganic Life* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2016), xi, 17, 27.

[29] 'Pas' in *Parages*, 19-116/10-101. All the essays in *Parages* deal with the work of Blanchot. For more on this death that is impossible to die, see PM1, 174-5/119-20.

[30] See AVE, 26/26, OA, 161/122, P1, 214/202-3, WC, 25 for various elaborations on this distinction.

[31] BS2, 194/131.

[32] **P, 121/, 129/ .**

[33] AVE, 26/26.

[34] Cf. CU, 326/n.a.

[35] "As something that escapes all use and all end, and more, as that which escapes our very capacity to undergo it, but whose trial we cannot escape. Yes, as though impossibility, that by which we are no longer able to be able, were waiting for us behind all that we live, think, and say." (BEI 308/207*t*)
[36] BEI, 65/46.
[37] In the second session of *La Vie la mort*, which would later be collected in *The Ear of the Other* as "Logique de la vivante," Derrida elaborates; "once again, the destruction of life is only an appearance: it is the destruction of the appearance of life. One buries or burns what is *already dead* so that life, the living... will be reborn and regenerated from these ashes." (OA 41/26)
[38] I will, of course, return to this at length in chapter 3.
[39] DB, 22/30.
[40] "Suffering is suffering when one can no longer suffer it, and when, because of this non-power, one cannot cease suffering it." (BEI 63/44)
[41] BEI, 310/209.
[42] The conjunction of necessity and impossibility, I'll show, will come to structure all of Derrida's quasi-transcendental arguments, including his thought of translation.
[43] As Blanchot elaborates, "time is as though arrested, merged with its interval. There, the present is without end, separated from every other present by an inexhaustible and empty infinite, the very infinite of suffering, and thus dispossessed of any future: a present without end and yet impossible as a present. The present of suffering is the abyss of the present, indefinitely hollowed out and in this hollowing indefinitely distended, radically alien to the possibility that one might be present to it through the mastery of presence. (BEI 63/44)
[44] DB, 60/49, 129/95-6. Here, one might say, is where the space for the affirmation of life in its lightness and gaiety arise: "at this moment both inescapable and improbable, the arrival of death at itself, this arrival of a death that never arrives and never happens to me – at this instant lightness, elation, beatitude remain the only affects that can take measure of this event as 'an unexperienced experience.'" (DB 83/65)
[45] DB, 83/65.
[46] See also Derrida's 'Afterword' in *Limited Inc.,* "Plenitude is the end (the goal) but were it attained, it would be the end (death). This non-end is not an extraneous vestige of the teleological essence of intention, it belongs to it as its most intimate and most irreducible other, as the other itself in it. It lasts as long as there is life, intention, language, or, as I prefer to say in general, the mark (or vice versa) (I take the liberty here of referring to what I say elsewhere of the finite infinite of the *différance*, in *Of Grammatology* and in *Speech and Phenomena*." (LI /129)
[47] DB, 89/69.
[48] CU, 327/n.a.
[49] See my discussion of Nietzsche, and Bataille's reading of the former in §4.3.
[50] Bataille returns to this conversation throughout *Inner Experience*, see *Œuvres complètes V*, 67/i 53, i 120/102. In *Guilty* in *Œuvres complètes V*, Bataille again returns to this discussion of Blanchot. See also Derrida's reference to this in §1.4 below.
[51] See Derrida's *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas* on this discussion of transcendence in immanence. I will engage Bataille and Deleuze's difficult concepts of immanence in §§4.2 and 4.3 below.
[52] OC5, 60/i 46.
[53] OC5, 101/i 85, 98/i 83.
[54] OC5, 337/i 93.
[55] For the necessity of a materialist reading of Derrida in thinking eco-deconstruction, see David Wood's "Spectres of Derrida: On the Way to Econstruction."
[56] Derrida notes, however, that he is not sure that there can be a 'concept' of an absolute outside. This is perhaps because the concept would still belong to a logic of restricted economy. But general economy must engage a relation between the classical concept and its loss of sense. What this means, as Derrida puts it in "From Restricted to General Economy," is that the concepts of matter or materialism, borrowed from classical philosophy, must be exposed to a certain sliding of their sense. However, he adds, "if the play of difference is indispensable for the correct reading of the general economy's concepts, and if each notion must be reinscribed within the law of its own sliding and must be related to the sovereign moments, one must not make of these requirements the subordinate moment of a structure. The reading of Bataille must pass through these two dangerous straits." (ED 401/345)
[57] PE, 69/50, WA, 128.
[58] LD, 10-11/4-5, 210/168-9.
[59] OC7, 22/a 13, 31/a 23.

[60] For the overlaps between growth and possibility, see "L'Économie à la mesure de l'univers," in OC5, 11. One could, I believe, propose an entire ecology as aqualogy based on the thoughts of the sea in Derrida's *Parages*, the bridges and shores that populate the second year of *La Chose* on Heidegger and Blanchot, all the way through to Esposito's *Categories of the Impolitical*.
[61] OC5, 154/i 133.
[62] OC7, 29/a 21.
[63] As I showed Blanchot write "less in saving everything from the flood than, on the contrary, in plunging all things into a deeper flood where they disappear prematurely and radically." (BEL 143/139)
[64] FF, 26. For more on this 'au-delà dedans,' see Derrida's discussion of Levinas in *Adieu*, and §1.3 below.
[65] PE, 56/41.
[66] 'Relève' is a translation Derrida uses for *Aufhebung*. It will be of huge importance to my discussions of translation, particularly in Derrida's "What is a Relevant Translation."
[67] "Perhaps, simply, into writing itself." (MP 21/19)
[68] Derrida often uses the term 'stricture' in relation to the double bind in general economy. The word is more common in English than in French, but both derive from the Late Latin 'strictura' from 'stringo' (tighten or compress). In French, it refers to the narrowing of an airway or other bodily passage, as it does in English, where the alternate meaning of a restriction or tightening is more common.
[69] ED, 376/323.
[70] I am grateful to Matthias Fritsch in helping me formulate this argument on the basis of his in "Deconstructive Aporias: Quasi-Transcendental and Normative," *The Continental Philosophy Review* 44 (2011): 439-468.
[71] ED, 378/325, 400/344. Derrida points to an affinity between Bataille and Blanchot on the transgression of the neutral; the impossible experience of the sovereign operation, he writes, is one of transgression. (ED 402-3/346-7)
[72] ED, 397/342, 380/327.
[73] In systems theoretical terms, one might say that general economy enters the system into relation with its unknowable environment. I will return to this latter discussion in my reading of autopoiesis, systems theory and translation theory in §6.2.2 and §6.2.3.
[74] ED, 388/334, 400 n1/440-1 n39.
[75] As he puts it in "*Ja,* or the Faux Bond II; "the ungraspable – remain(s) ("the skidding that forces a certain letting go" ["Dissemination"], a certain de-clinging of the dual or dialectical unity) is the relation without relation of the two columns or colossi or bands; it is what sets the gap... in motion." (PDS 25/17)
[76] As Derrida puts it, "this 'already' exceeds the thinking of production toward an 'unproduction' that would not be its negative either, but rather an 'oblivion' that no economy... can get the better of." (PDS 45/38) At stake in *Glas* is an unlivable impossibility, "capable only of overturning, paralyzing, or exceeding any system and history, of interrupting the life of the concept, of cutting off its breath, or better, what comes down to the same thing, of supporting it from outside or underneath a crypt." (G 232/166)
[77] G, 47/34.
[78] G, 187/134.
[79] CP, 426/399.
[80] Cf. "One Two Three – Speculation without Term" in CP, 303-311/283-291.
[81] As Derrida puts it, pushed to its extreme, in the calculation of the alleged risk of welcoming too many others into itself, the organism dies, "it's an organism that wishes to protect itself by blocking all its orifices: death is assured," but to open oneself to the incalculable alone itself comes down to death. (MH 137*t*)
[82] L1, 4. Derrida here is playing on the French homophony of *et* [and] and *est* [is].
[83] CP, 428/401.
[84] CP, 278/260.
[85] P, **38/ , 51/.**
[86] See CP, 415/389 on bindinal economy.
[87] In suggesting that the Concept is life itself, Canguilhem indeed finds himself very close to Aristotle, proposing more than a simple correspondence between the logical principle of non-contradiction and the biological principle of specific reproduction.
[88] CC, 108/61, 126/73.
[89] Canguilhem distinguishes between the proper, scientific Concept and the improper, non-scientific metaphor in understanding life as communication, message, coding and decoding. Canguilhem turns to Claude Bernard, who proposes his thought of life across two axioms: *life is death*, and *life is creation*. Of these, only creation is properly vital: the physico-chemical functioning of an organism is that by which the organism destroys itself; death. Since

one can understand and calculate these physical phenomena, one mistakes them for life. Truly vital, organic creativity, however, operates according to form-giving morphological syntheses already at work in the chemical syntheses in the protoplasm. These morphological syntheses are, for Bernard, not yet a purely chemical substance, but rather the hereditary continuation of another protoplasmic ancestor whose origin escapes us. Bernard refers to this as "'the primitive action of an instruction [*consigne*] that nature repeats after having regulated it in advance.'" (CE 358*t*) In his thought of life as creation, Bernard had thus anticipated for Canguilhem the notion of biological heredity as occurring through the transmission of coded information. All the terms used in his work, "*instruction* [consigne], *guiding idea, vital design, vital pre-scription* [préordonnance], *vital plan, sense of phenomena*" are for Canguilhem *metaphors* used in the stead of an adequate philosophical and scientific *concept*. After Watson and Crick referred to a code of instruction, information and programme in describing DNA, contemporary biology began to change its language, grounding itself in the language of communication. Along with those of message, code and decoding, these terms would form the new *concepts* of life. But these, he writes, are not metaphors in the way Bernard's were. Cf. also CE, 360.

[90] Again, how one understands this resistance will be very important in Foucault's reading of Bichat I'll engage in §5.2.2, who indeed develops the notion of a personal and impersonal death quite closely to Blanchot, which would be picked up by Deleuze and Esposito.

[91] "It is as absurd to seek in biology a justification for a politics and economics of exploitation of man by man as it would be to deny the truth of functional hierarchies in the living organism and the integration of functions of relations at ascending levels (Sherrington) simply because one is a partisan, for reasons of social justice, of a classless society." (CC 125/73)

[92] On Derrida's reading of Heidegger's *Nietzsche*, see §4.1.

[93] CC, 184/111. Canguilhem draws from the work of Jakob von Uexküll here, of fundamental importance to the questions of autopoiesis I'll discuss in §2.1 and §6.2. Cf. Jakob von Uexküll, *A Foray into the Worlds of Animals and Humans, with a Theory of Meaning* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2010).

[94] This is what Esposito will develop as the reciprocal immanence of the 'form' and norm of life. Such a conception, however, would have to distinguish its use of 'form' from that of *eidos*, *morphe*, ideality, etc., although the unification of 'form' and norm indeed corresponds to the Concept that fixes everything by way of Form. To put it all to quickly, it is this belief in the lack of any *spacing* in the immanent ontology of the organism that poses formidable ethical and biopolitical problems: every difference between what I will later call affirmative biopolitics and a doubly affirmative deconstruction of biopolitics could play itself out here; perhaps aided by a questionable translation of *The Normal and the Pathological*, "health is the possibility of *transcending* [dépasser] the norm, the possibility of tolerating infractions of the habitual norm and instituting new norms in new situations." (CN 130/196-7)

[95] In the social order, however, things become different. As he puts it, "if social norms could be perceived as clearly as organic norms, men would be mad not to conform to them." (CN 194/259) Social norms are not to be observed, but to be invented. It is in this sense that Canguilhem proposes the concept of error as a new concept in pathology. While error used to be simply metaphorical, with the advent of the concept of life articulating itself in terms of information, code and message, it has now shifted to the domain of analogy. (Derrida, of course, proposes a thorough deconstruction of this 'three-step waltz' between the concept, the metaphor and analogy in *La Vie la mort*.) In this sense, "to know is to inform oneself, to learn to decipher or decode. There is then no difference between the error of life and the error of thought. Between the errors of informing and informed information. The first furnishes the key the second." (CN 209/277) Canguilhem here recalls the proximity to Aristotle one reads in "Le Concept et la vie," "on the condition, of course, that Aristotelian psychobiology and the modern technology of transmission not be confused." (CN 209/278) The author refers here in a footnote to the work of Gilbert Simondon, also of huge importance to Deleuze and Esposito.

[96] CN, 132/199.

[97] CC, 187-8/113.

[98] See Nietzsche's critique of 'consumptive Spinoza.' One ought be careful to think the action/reaction difference in Deleuze otherwise than Derrida's distinction between mechanical reactivity and the self-presence of response, although many secondary readings of Deleuze would invite a critique of the former on the basis of the latter. See also, in §5.4, Esposito's positioning of Bataille against "the 'restricted economy' of a *conservatio vitae*." (EC 18)

[99] Health and disease "are not distinct entities which would quarrel over the living organism like a battle field... there are only differences of degree between sickness and health: the exaggeration, disproportion, disharmony of normal phenomena constitute the morbid state." (L3, 17-8*t*) Derrida indeed remarks being surprised that Canguilhem never cites Nietzsche. (L3, 17*t*)

[100] I will return to these discussions, particularly with reference to Spinoza and Nietzsche, in chapters 4 and 5.

[101] See on this "Psyche: Inventions of the Other" in P1, 27/15.
[102] The relationship between Derrida and Levinas has been the focus of a wealth of scholarship to which I cannot do justice here. Allow me to refer to some of the key texts. Robert Bernasconi, "The Trace of Levinas in Derrida," in *Derrida and Différance*, David Wood and Robert Bernasconi, eds. (Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 1988), 13-30; Simon Critchley, *The Ethics of Deconstruction: Derrida and Levinas, Third Edition* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2014) and *Ethics-Politics-Subjectivity: Essays on Derrida, Levinas & Contemporary French Thought* (London, Verso, 1999); John Llewelyn, *Appositions of Jacques Derrida and Emmanuel Levinas* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2001). For a dissenting opinion on the relationship between Derrida and Levinas, see Martin Hägglund, *Radical Atheism: Derrida and the Time of Life* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2008). For something of a middle-ground between the two, see Fritsch, "Deconstructive Aporias: Quasi-Transcendental and Normative."
[103] L1, 22.
[104] This operative value of the concept is also, as Canguilhem writes in "Aspects of Vitalism" what gives vitalism its due: its contribution towards progress in science.
[105] See also on this Derrida's "White Mythology" in MP, 323/270-1.
[106] L3, 24.
[107] FF, 8. "Form and Fashion" is the preface to Alain David's *Racisme et antisémitisme: Essai de philosophie sur l'envers des concepts*. (Paris, Ellipses, 2001).
[108] But Heidegger, I'll show in §3.1.2, actually says something similar about the reduction of beings to their economic use-value and of nature to a standing reserve in the translation of *morphè* to *eidos* or *idea*.
[109] This is why, I believe, one ought to take Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche so seriously, and Derrida's reading of these two as well. See §4.1 and §4.4.1 below. In fact, Derrida and David's critique of form is not so different from Heidegger's, see again §3.1.2.
[110] WA, 73.
[111] One could, space permitted, provide a thorough comparison of this concept of enframing with that developed by Judith Butler in *Frames of War* (London, Verso, 2010), and elaborated by Cary Wolfe in *Before the Law: Humans and Other Animals in a Biopolitical Frame* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2013).
[112] This will structure everything Derrida will say about Heidegger's *Zusage* in my chapter 3 and double affirmation in chapters 4 and 5.
[113] Derrida also mentions Lacan here.
[114] In *Existence and Existents*, Levinas writes of an experience "si ce terme n'était pas impossible dans une relation qui va au-delà du monde – de l'altérité d'autrui." (in FF 26)
[115] "But we have just seen how that at-home... what properly belongs to an economy, someone's own economy, is anonymously dedicated, divides itself and submits to the other who was waiting there for him already, without waiting for him." (P 204/178)
[116] In both, I argue, Levinas provides an immensely important step/not beyond these ecologies and, in both, points towards the remaining of an arche-materiality of life death and survivance that resists its reappropriation in Husserl's Living Present and in Heidegger's question of being, and along with it all the anthropocentric presuppositions structuring the epistemology, ontology and ethics of both. In Husserl, this will be the trace, I will say the tra(nscenden)ce of a past which has never been present, which interrupts the dialectic of the Living Present to let the other come, whatever it may be. In Heidegger, this will be the remaining, I will say res(is)tance of the *Zusage*, a response in a 'yes' anterior to all questioning, which ex-propriates everything Heidegger had wished to reserve to the human and denied to the nonhuman. (Derrida returns to both these points in *Adieu: Emmanuel Levinas*. For Husserl, cf. 113-5/61-2, for Heidegger, cf. 51-3/22-5, 63/31. See also my discussion on the remainder above in §1.2.2).
[117] AEL, 15/4, 96-7/61. See also HJR, 81.
[118] "Relation *without* relation, passivity *without* passivity, '*passivity more passive than every passivity*.'" (AEL 58/28)
[119] AEL, 138/78, 128/70. See my chapters 4 and 5.
[120] AEL, 173/99.
[121] AEL, 168/96.
[122] The equivocal *sur*- of survivance is also, he writes, that of a passage by *trans*-lation, both the transgression and reappropriation of the economy of any language. P, 130-1/113. Of course, an attention to the differences between how a living being and a text or a language live-on ought also be taken into consideration.
[123] P1, 214/203, OA, 161/121-2.

[124] As Derrida suggests in this seminar, however, Benjamin's 'profound vitalism' could really only consider the relation of translation as one between two spoken languages, the immediate co-presence of life to the voice could not really engage written texts. Replaying a famous concern of Derrida's in *Of Grammatology*, *Voice and Phenomenon, Dissemination* and elsewhere, Derrida recalls that Benjamin's proximity to Husserl here is not by chance, the latter's philosophy of language also being guided, he writes, "by a vitalist spiritualism, finally a valorization of the living [*du vivant*], of the voice and of the word as a living spiritual body [*corps*]." (B3, 4-5)
[125] P1, 207/196, 214/203.
[126] Cf. MP, 288/241.
[127] OA, 159/120.
[128] TR, 563/178.
[129] As he puts it in "Living On: Borderlines," "*Übersetzung* and 'translation' overcome, equivocally, in the course of an equivocal combat, the loss of an object." (P 147/128)
[130] P1, 234/223.
[131] The expression 'Material-Discursive' is perhaps more common, but I feel risks the problematic appropriation of Derrida's thinking in the 'linguistic turn.' Arche-writing does not entail that everything becomes discourse. Indeed, in thinking the resistance of the material-semiotic as anterior to the opposition between force and resistance, we could bring Foucault' discussion of Blanchot in "The Thought of the Outside" as that which "escapes the mode of being of discourse." (DE1 520/148-9) See §5.2.3.
[132] P1, 235/224.
[133] FP, 4, 33. Before the material-semiotic event, as Derrida draws from Heidegger, translation is "an operation of thought through which we must translate ourselves into the thought of the other language, the forgotten thinking of the other language; we must translate ourselves into it, not make it come into our language but, on the contrary, go toward the unthought thinking of the other language." (OA 152/115*t*)
[134] TR 574/198, see also 'Psyche: Invention of the Other' in P1.
[135] LV, 40.
[136] BCI, 17/7, 21/9, 24/11, 25/12.
[137] See also AEL, 21/20.
[138] DJ, 34. See also, in this respect, Derrida's discussion of Nancy in *On Touching*, where one might read ecology as an impossible knowledge without knowledge, "the interruption in the contact of continuity with what we have learned to call 'nature.'" (LT 83/68) This relation without relation, or contact without contact, he adds, "is produced in 'nature,' well before man, and always before the distinction between the beings and the living. And this is enough to discredit every opposition fundamentally; nature/culture, nature/mind of consciousness, *physis* or *nomos*, *thesis* or *tekhne*, animality/humanity and so forth." (LT 83/68) But this interruption must be thought right alongside contamination; "contamination then becomes what it is not, it disidentifies itself. It disidentifies everything even before it dis-identifies itself. It disappropriates, it disappropriates itself, it attains what it should never signify, an interruption of relations and the ex-propriety of the proper." (LT 90/75) If interruption and contamination precede any opposition of the human to its other, "we should then reintroduce the outside itself, the other, the inanimate, material nature, the nonliving, the nonphysical in general, language, rhetoric, technics, and so forth – all that this phenomenological reduction to the sphere of pure appurtenance of the 'solipsistic' body proper tries to keep out. Life of the living present and life as 'transcendental life' are, as always, the great question, to which we shall not yet again return to here." (LT 206/180) But these will, of course, by my key concerns in chapter 2.
[139] DJ, 20. Again, I will discuss this at length in my next chapter.
[140] This phrase actually appears lifted almost word-for-word from Blanchot's *A Voice from Elsewhere*, "CONTRETEMPS: that is, differently perhaps, the anticipation of looking back through retrospection that gives the illusion of a present that has always been lost, since it never existed." (BVA 41/27)
[141] A, 75/39.
[142] I refer here, of course, to Judith Butler's *Precarious Life* (London, Verso, 2006) and *Frames of War*.
[143] FSC, 68-9, notice the –tr again.
[144] AV, 22.
[145] The promise of the earth, Derrida writes, "would be just as foreign to the egological horizon that structures a phenomenology of time (Husserl) as it would to the order or existential horizon of temporal ek-stases (Heidegger)." (AV 29*t*) I showed Derrida write above, let us recall, the necessity of entering Freud's thought of the death drive in relation with what Husserl and Heidegger say about time.

Notes to chapter two: Transcendence and the Surviving Present

[1] See also my reading of "Avowing: The Impossible" in §1.4.2, especially DJ, 20.

[2] Jean-Paul Sartre, *La Transcendance de l'ego: Esquisse d'une description phénoménologique* (Paris, Vrin, 1966); trans. Forrest Williams and Robert Kirkpatrick as *The Transcendence of the Ego: An Existentialist Theory of Consciousness* (New York, Hill and Wang, 1991). On transcendence and immanence in Husserl, see Rudolf Boehm, "Les Ambigüités des concepts husserliens d' 'immanence' et de 'transcendance,'" *Revue philosophique de la France et de l'étranger* 84 (1959): 481-526. The question of what it is exactly that transcends transcendental subjectivity will also prove essential to certain discussions of speculative realism. On the one hand, phenomenology is understood in these circles as antirealist precisely because it brackets the transcendences of the material world. See here Tom Sparrow, *The End of Phenomenology* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2014). On the other hand, the transcendence of the Living Present as developed by Levinas and Derrida can also mean its ethical relation with the trace of an absolute alterity. How these two transcendences, beyond and below the plane of immanence are to be articulated, if such oppositions can still be said to hold, remains to be examined. It would be important to remark on the similarities and differences with respect to Deleuze's description of the pre-subjective transcendental field as the plane of immanence in *Difference and Repetition, The Logic of Sense*, *What is Philosophy?* and his final essay "Immanence: A Life." Precisely at stake for Deleuze is the necessity of going beyond the 'phenomenological' immanence of transcendental and empirical life towards something else, towards the Outside, as he deems the plane of immanence. I will discuss the Outside as the site of a double, Blanchotian relation to death in Deleuze in §4.2.2 and §4.2.3. One should also note that the Living Present is of fundamental importance to Deleuze's formulations of passive synthesis in *Difference and Repetition* and *The Logic of Sense.* For a rare discussion on Deleuze's relation to phenomenology, see Joe Hughes, *Deleuze and the Genesis of Representation* (London, Continuum, 2008) and *Philosophy After Deleuze: Deleuze and the Genesis of Representation II* (London, Bloomsbury, 2012).

[3] See also HF, 340-1.

[4] See also, in this respect, Foucault's introduction to Canguilhem's *Knowledge of Life*, "Life, Experience, Science." I'll take up a reading of this piece in §5.2.2.

[5] Cf. FA, 41/xxxi. For a beautiful account of transcendence in Husserl, see Natalie Depraz, *Transcendance et Incarnation: Le Statut de l'intersubjectivité comme altérité à soi chez Husserl* (Paris, Vrin, 1995).

[6] AEL, 138/76, 146/80.

[7] DG, 91/62.

[8] From within but, Derrida adds in parentheses, "it is precisely a question of the effraction of the within." PDS, 278/263. For reasons of temporal and spatial economy, I cannot engage the many important and nuanced critiques of Derrida's reading of Husserl. For a useful summary and evaluation of these, see Martin Hägglund's "Arche-Writing: Derrida and Husserl" in *Radical Atheism*.

[9] As Derrida adds here, the difficulties of differentiating between the living and the non-living will have also been explored in Hegel, Freud, Husserl and Heidegger. I covered the first two in §§1.1.1 and 1.2.2, will examine Husserl in this chapter, and turn to Heidegger in the next.

[10] See my discussion on Blanchot and Bataille's notion of community in §1.4.2.

[11] That phenomenology is a philosophy of life is among the opening claims in *Voice and Phenomenon*, to which I will return below.

[12] Neal DeRoo's *Futurity in Phenomenology: Promise and Method in Husserl, Levinas, and Derrida* (New York, Fordham University Press, 2013) is one of the best books I've read on the relations between the thinkers in its title. However, a certain difficulty in his analysis of the passage from passive to active synthesis risks reintroducing important anthropocentric presuppositions. Despite acknowledging that animals and humans both have a world, animals experience it through the passive synthesis of sense, whereas humans can also do so through the active synthesis of meaning. "The gap between these two is a 'quantum leap,' a qualitative and not merely a quantitative difference." Ibid., 34. A difference in kind and not a difference in degree. Indeed, DeRoo even concedes that in active synthesis, humans recognize things 'as such.' The Heideggerean overtones here cannot be overstated (the animal has a world, but is poor in world [*weltarm*]), and I will return to the important technical use of the 'as such' here and in chapter 3. The distinction between reaction and response, so fundamental to the anthropocentric axiomatic, also finds itself drawn along in this distinction between passive and active synthesis.

[13] The same, I'll note in passing, can be said about auto-affection.

[14] PG, 238 n. 41/209 n. 41. See also NII, 148-9, DDP, 444/2, 117. Husserl's most in-depth meditations on the topic in the so-called C-manuscripts, summarized by Tran Duc Thao here and elsewhere, were unpublished at the time of Derrida's dissertation, have only been published in 2006 as the eighth volume of the *Materialen* series of the collected *Husserliana,* and remain untranslated in English or French. I am grateful to Matthias Fritsch for his

assistance in translating the passages cited herein. Tran Duc Thao's last published essay was entitled "The Logic of the Living Present." Here I also acknowledge a debt to David Wood's landmark essay for deconstruction and environmental ethics, "Spectres of Derrida: On the Way to Econstruction," and its assertion that any environmental ethics must bear a thorough commitment to materialism. Wood notes that Derrida's materialism is deeply indebted to Tran Duc Thao. As Derrida notes in an interview, it was Foucault who had recommended reading Tran Duc Thao's book to him, "by saying, and I later thought the same thing, that the first half was very interesting while the second half was more problematic." (HF 340)

[15] Derrida in fact devotes a long study of Heidegger's dislocations of the Husserlian Living Present in his 1964-5 seminar *Heidegger: The Question of Being and History*. See §3.2.1.

[16] See on this Derrida's remarks in "Différance" in MP, 22/21.

[17] Cf. Wood, "Spectres of Derrida," 285.

[18] Tran Duc Thao, *Phénoménologie et matérialisme dialectique* (Paris, Gordon & Breach, 1971); trans. Daniel J. Herman and Donal V. Morano (Dordrecht, D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1986), 139 n1/227 n5

[19] Ibid., 139-40 n1/228 n5.

[20] Husserl, in the C manuscripts, writes that "my standing-streaming life as monad is primordial monad, and in it my monad is already implied as one in the universe of monads." ... "Without it [the living present], nothing at all has being, and likewise the others and the world implied in it with human birth and human death." (HUA M 8 22) Further, "My living and moving present, my present in its primordial mode, bears within itself all conceivable being: it is the primordially temporal temporality that is supratemporal," "it [my streaming-living present] is the primordially temporal, supra-temporal 'temporality,' which bears within itself all time as the temporal order and fullness that persists in being." (HUA M 8 22) Husserl's *Analyses Concerning Active and Passive Synthesis*, which Derrida never cites, also engage the questions of death, immortality and indeed living-on in relation to time. The introduction to this work suggests that even genetic phenomenology is incapable of dealing with death as a constitutive disruption of the Living Present. (Hua 11 n.a./xxxiii-xxxiv) Rather, genetic phenomenology insists on the immortality of transcendental subjectivity. "Since every transcendental, subjective life is consciousness, intentional life, and since everything that we place as a cogito into immanent time itself corresponds to the primordial law of consciousness, to the primordial law of time-constitution, then the 'immortality' of every retentional flux means the same thing as the immortality of every particular consciousness, that is, each temporal transformation as temporally modified." (Hua 11 422/527) In fact, Husserl curiously describes the immortal enduring of the present as a living on. Within time-consciousness, "the process of living-on [*Das Fortleben*], and the ego that lives on [*das Ich, das fortlebt*], are immortal." (Hua 11 378/467) However, he notes, while the pure transcendental ego is immortal, the empirical world-ego is not. "We do not at all deny the latter's death, its corporeal decomposition, and thus the fact that it cannot be found in the objective, spatio-temporal world, its non-existence." (Hua 11 378/467) And later, "birth and death, the emergence of human beings in nature and their disappearance from nature, say, through creation or destruction, is quite compatible with the transcendental infinity of life." (Hua 11 380-1/471) If one conceives of the Living Present as an "unending immanent time," from which one can never escape, "transcendental life and the transcendental ego cannot be born; only the human being in the world can be born. The ego as transcendental ego was eternal; I am now, and belonging to this Now is a horizon of the past that can be unraveled into infinity. And this means precisely, the ego was eternal." (Hua 11 379/469)

[21] "The absolute subjectivity whose very properties cannot be named: *Fur all das fehlen uns die Namen*. [we lack all names for this]." *Phenomenology and Dialectical Materialism*, 141 n1/229 n5. I will return to this in my discussion of *Voice and Phenomenon* in §2.3.1.

[22] Tran Duc Thao, *Phenomenology and Dialectical Materialism*, 143 n1/230 n5.

[23] Ibid., 139 n1/228 n5.

[24] cf PG vii/xv. Cf. also Leonard Lawlor, *Derrida and Husserl: The Basic Problem of Phenomenology* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2002), 48. It is important to note that Derrida's 1954 thesis argues that Tran Duc Thao and Jean Cavaillès's dialectical critiques of the subjectivism inherent in phenomenology do not go far enough, as indeed all the great dialectics from Plato to Hegel to dialectical materialism would remain worldly, "they are said to have always instituted themselves on the basis of an already formalized 'secondary' opposition between form and matter, sense and the sensible, and so on." (PG 8/xxii) It is thus through recourse to a pre-subjective transcendental field in Husserl's phenomenology, one to which Derrida would return to in "Eating Well" (in PDS) that the dialectic of the Living Present originarily interrupts itself.

[25] PG, 8/xxi.

[26] But of course, the structure of this 'beyond' would resist a simpler analysis, since one could say that such a formula corresponds precisely to dialectics. As Derrida cites Hegel's Jena logic in *Glas,* "the absolute must be

conceived as the 'identity of identity and nonidentity." (G 117/83) On how the logic of the 'without' ought be understood otherwise, see §1.2.2 above. See also "Negotiations," "But the dialectic (a Hegelian would say) is precisely the dialectic of the nondialectic and the dialectic" against which Derrida raises the value of the *affirmation*. Cf. NII, 26. See §4.4 below.

[27] TS, 33.

[28] TS, 33. I'll return to the question of a non-dialectical weakness in Nietzsche in my fourth and fifth chapters. One will also see Derrida refer to the philosophical *invulnerability* of the Living Present in his 1964-5 seminar on Heidegger, anticipating the necessity of its inscription in weakness, vulnerability, and sufferability.

[29] MP, 188/158.

[30] See my discussion of "Form and Fashion" in §1.3.2.

[31] Evan Thompson, *Mind in Life: Biology, Phenomenology and the Sciences of Mind* (Cambridge, the Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2007). It should be noted that Thompson's account of autopoiesis is one among many. The concept as developed by Cary Wolfe in *Critical Environments: Postmodern Theory and the Pragmatics of the 'Outside'* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1998)*, Animal Rites: American Culture, the Discourse of Species and Posthumanist Theory* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2003) and *What is Posthumanism* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2010)*,* along with his forthcoming piece in *Eco-Deconstruction: Derrida and Environmental Philosophy* (eds. Fritsch, Lynes, Wood) offers an account of autopoiesis which perfectly coheres with the deconstructive logic of supplementarity with which I am attempting to think the living in these pages, as something of an auto-hetero-poiesis. See also §6.2.2.

[32] Hans Jonas, *The Phenomenon of Life: Towards a Philosophical Biology* (Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 2001), 4-5.

[33] Ibid., 76, 83, 85.

[34] Or, Jonas adds, "become[] dormant as do certain seeds and spores." Ibid. 76.

[35] Ibid., 106. The emancipation from the fixed self-identity of matter, for Jonas, is purchased at the price of precariousness; matter's organization into life is "not a success story... intrinsically qualified by the threat of its negative, [life] must affirm itself, and existence affirmed is existence as a concern. So constitutive for life is the possibility of not-being that its very being is essentially a hovering over this abyss, a skirting of its brink." Indeed, he adds, the fear of death itself arose when matter turned organic, which is perhaps why Derrida identifies Freud's death drive to return to the inorganic with Husserl's Living Present. See also Thompson, *Mind in Life*, 155.

[36] Thompson, *Mind in Life*, 47. Of course, I will be unable to even remotely address the philosophy of Merleau-Ponty in its complexity in these chapters, despite of course its undeniable importance. See especially Derrida's LT.

[37] "The organism cannot be compared to a keyboard on which the external stimuli would play and in which their proper form would be delineated for the simple reason that the organism contributes to the constitution of that form." Cited in Thompson, *Mind in Life*, 47. See also Ibid., 67.

[38] Hans Jonas, *The Phenomenon of Life*, 243.

[39] Thompson, *Mind in Life*, 155, 229-30.

[40] Ibid., 362.

[41] Cf. "Form and Fashion" on this, my discussion of the underside of the Concept of life in §1.3.2, and compare Tran Duc Thao's dialectics of the Living Present: ""a preservation and perpetual conquest of self... the self remains identical to itself, while renewing itself constantly; it remains precisely the same only by always becoming another, in that *absolute flux of an eternal Present*." Tran Duc Thao, *Phenomenology and Dialectical Materialism*, 139 n1/228 n5.

[42] ED, 244/205.

[43] The terms are almost certainly to be understood in a Heideggerean sense here. As Derrida notes in an interview with Dominique Janicaud, "*The Problem of Genesis in Husserl's Phenomenology* was a work that would not have been possible without Heidegger. Sometimes I mention it, sometimes I do not, but the questions that I address to Husserl, or the type of reading that I venture at that point in time, implied a certain relation to Heidegger." (HF 339) Readers interested in examining Derrida's philosophical formation from existentialism to an allegedly Christian Heideggerianism are invited to see Edward Baring's fascinating study of Derrida's student papers in *The Young Derrida and French Philosophy, 1945-1968* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[44] PG, 30/xl, 30n1/187n48.

[45] "*Aller tranzendierenden Voraussetzungen von Existierendem*," as Derrida cites him in *The Problem of Genesis.*

[46] PG, 119/61-2. See Hua 3 §85. *Sensile hylè, Intentional morphè*.

[47] Derrida would return to this 'spectrality' of the noema in *Spectres of Marx*, "the radical possibility of all spectrality should be sought in the direction that Husserl identifies… as an intentional but *non-real [non-réelle]*

component of phenomenological lived experience. Unlike the three other terms of the two correlations… this intentional but *non-real* inclusion of the noematic correlate is neither 'in' the world not 'in' consciousness. But it is precisely the condition of any experience, any objectivity, any phenomenality… Is not such an '*irreality' [irréellité] its independence both* in relation to the world *and* in relation to the *real* stuff of egological subjectivity, the very place of apparition, the essential, general, non-regional possibility of the spectre? Is it not also what inscribes the possibility of the other and of mourning right onto the phenomenality of the phenomenon?" (SM 216/237-8)

[48] PCM, 79/114.

[49] Thompson explains this as Husserl's notion of transcendence-within-immanence, of consciousness as intrinsically self-transcending; "at a transcendental level, what is *really or genuinely transcendent* is also *phenomenologically immanent*… External events are *really transcendent*, nevertheless, they are *intentionally immanent*." See Thompson's account of the debate between representationalist and non-representationalist accounts of the noema. Thompson, *Mind in Life*, 446n9. For the non-representationalist, "the noema is the objet itself, but the object considered phenomenologically, that is, precisely, in its givenness." Ibid.,

[50] See Hua 3 § 36.

[51] PG, 121/63, see also Hua 10 §36.

[52] Hua 10 §36. This passage will be of huge importance to Derrida's difficult footnote at the end of *Voice and Phenomenon*, to which I will turn in §2.3.1.

[53] PG 126/66; "subjectivity is time temporizing *itself*. Time is subjectivity accomplishing *itself* as subjectivity."

[54] "'Urhyle,' i.e. temporal *hylè*... as the 'kernel of the other-to-I' [*noyeau de l'étranger-au-je*] *(Ichfremde Kern*). Cf. *Group C 6* (August 1930) 6." (IOG 83n1/86n90*t*) As Husserl explains it, "The *urhylè* in its own temporalizing is the kernel that is, so to speak, foreign to the I in the concrete present." (HUA M 8 110)

[55] PG, 38/3.

[56] cf. ED, 246-7, PCM, 82-3/116-117.

[57] Hua 17 §96.

[58] Derrida calls this the 'archon function' of commencement and commandment.

[59] IOG, 45/57.

[60] ED, 250/209.

[61] For the justification of this structure, see Derrida's footnote in PG, 39n1/187n12. I don't have the space here to discuss the first form of the idea from Husserl's *Logical Investigations* concerning the infinite becoming of logic.

[62] ED, 242/204.

[63] PG, 158/90.

[64] "*Would indeed be inevitably modified by a nullifying of the thing-world,* [it] *would not be affected thereby in its own existence*." (Hua 3 §49) As Derrida cites a note from Ricoeur's translation, "dans la ruine du monde je serais encore conscience intentionnelle mais visant le chaos." [in the ruin of the world I would still be an intentional consciousness but facing chaos.] In PD, Derrida credits Ricoeur for introducing him to *Ideas I*, as well as Levinas's *Totality and Infinity*. Emmanuel Levinas, *Totalité et infini: Essai sur l'extériorité* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1971); trans. Alphonso Lingis as *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1979).

[65] FP, 23.

[66] PG, 141/77.

[67] PG, 187/110.

[68] PG, 187/110, 192/113.

[69] The same could be said of Plato, Husserl may be the last great figure of the Platonic *idea, eidos*, Form, *morphè*. Although, Derrida notes in the *Introduction,* Husserl's notion of the Idea is to be differentiated from the *eidos*, the Idea has no essence, "as the invisible condition of *evidence*, by preserving the *seen*, it loses any reference to *seeing* indicated in *eidos*, a notion from which it nevertheless results in its mysterious Platonic focus. The Idea can only be *understood* [or *heard: entendre*]." (IOG, 156n2/124n170) In "Form and Meaning," however, he remarks that despite Husserl's attempt to define *eidos* against Platonism, Form and the *morphè*, "the force, vigilance, efficacity of the critique remain intrametaphysical by means of all their resources." (MP, 187-8/157) Heidegger, for his part, argues that the shift from early Greek thinking occurs in thinking *phusis* as *idea.* On the other hand, Heidegger is also critical of the Nietzschean reversal of the intelligible into the sensible (a reversal which is itself not so simple), which he believes occurs at the crest of Western metaphysics and its determination of being as *phusis/idea*. The danger in so much contemporary thought, however, is that an overcoming of Platonism can only occur in an uncritical reversal of Platonism. If pure ideality and pure reality come down to the same thing, however, something must be thought otherwise. I will return to this in §3.1.2 and §4.1.

[70] Reflecting on his introduction to *The Origin of Geometry* several decades later, Derrida writes that this text "enabled me to approach something like the un-thought axiomatics of Husserlian phenomenology, its 'principle of principles,' that is to say, intuitionism, the absolute privilege of the living present... to the necessity of recourse, in eidetic or transcendental description, to a language that could not itself be submitted to the *epochè* (to the epoch) – without itself being simply 'in the world' – thus to a language that remained naive, even though it made possible all the phenomenological bracketings and parentheses." (DDP, 445/117-80) I will recall from my discussion of translation in §1.4.1 that materiality is what limits the possibility of translation.
[71] IOG, 64/72.
[72] IOG, 73/79.
[73] IOG, 79n1/83n86.
[74] One might articulate general ecology, the *without* binding the dialectic of the Living Present to its finitude in the homophony of a *Terre sans terre = terre s'enterre*.
[75] "The primordial streaming is constant primordial constituting; in it, the 'stream of consciousness' is constituted in its primordial temporality. Certainly this is quite understandable: it is a pre-time… As pre-being, it cannot be experienced or said. As soon as that which cannot be said or experienced has been shown—that is, has been experienced after all, and made the topic of an assertion—it is simply ontified [or rendered ontic]." (HUA M 8, 269)
[76] IOG, 107/104-5.
[77] "Linked to the theme of intentionality in general, to the idea of a philosophical 'task,' it was also implicitly of a piece with the infinite idea in all its forms: the infinite becoming of logic, the idea of an infinite totality of lived experiences of the pure me, the idea of the world as infinite possibility and infinite foundation of experience, and so forth." (PG 241/148-9)
[78] "Time is perpetual promotion of crises and a leaving behind of them, where the passively constituted moment participates in the originary movement of active constitution." (PG 274/172)
[79] Derrida recalls Husserl's description of the non-reellity of the noema here; IOG, 33/48, 159/144.
[80] IOG, 35/49.
[81] "The fact does not teach us through its factical content but as an *example*. It is due to this *after*'s own specific character, in the necessity of preserving transcendence or reduced factuality as clue, that the particular historicity of phenomenological discourse is announced." (IOG 35n1/50n42) See also Ibid., 161/146.
[82] IOG, 82n1/86n89.
[83] Despite its inclusiveness, a certain eurocentrism in Husserl can be read, as Derrida often cites him, in writing that "just as man *and even the Papuan* represent a new stage of animal nature, i.e., as opposed to the beast, so philosophical reason represents a new stage of human nature and its reason." Cited in IOG, 162/146. Papua New Guinea, by the way, is the home of the greatest biocultural diversity on earth.
[84] PCM, 83/117.
[85] IOG, 151n1/138n164. I will of course return to Heidegger at length in chapter 3.
[86] See also BS1, 363/270.
[87] BS2, 370/269.
[88] See §4.1 for my discussion of Nietzsche, Heidegger, perspectivism and value.
[89] Recall here transgression along with all the other tr- movements interrupting economy in §1.2.2.
[90] In describing intentionality as the unconditional hospitality accorded to the face of the other, Levinas would have introduced a mutation within phenomenology, "a singular interruption, a suspension or *epochè* of phenomenology itself, even more and even earlier than a phenomenological *epochè*." (AEL 95/51) This interruption would not be one among others within phenomenology, but rather that by which "phenomenology... *interrupts itself*." (AEL 96/51) However, Derrida adds, a certain interruption of phenomenology had perhaps already imposed itself against Husserl's principle of principles; the transcendence and the other in analogical appresentation. And again, "what is said here of the other cannot be separated, as we have insisted elsewhere, from alterity as the movement of temporalization. In other words, 'Time and the Other,' to cite a title." (AEL 96/52) Derrida is referring to Levinas's 1946-7 lecture here. Emmanuel Levinas, *Le Temps et l'autre* (Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1983); trans. Richard A. Cohen as *Time and the Other (and additional essays)* (Pittsburgh, Duquesne University Press, 1987).
[91] I will examine this with respect to Heidegger's *Zusage* in chapter 3, as well as the concept of affirmation in chapter 4.
[92] Derrida will refer elsewhere to the "*philosophical invulnerability*" of the Living Present (HQ 210/139); "the Living Present is the phenomenological absolute out of which I can never exit because it is that within which, towards which, and starting from which every exit is effectuated." (IOG 149/136*t*) Even as a thought of originary difference, the dialectic of the Living Present operates in "the powerlessness to remain enclosed in the innocent

undividedness [*indivision*] of the originary Absolute, because it is *present* only in *deferring* itself without respite, this powerlessness and this impossibility are given in an originary and pure consciousness of Difference." (IOG 171/153*t*)

[93] "Not pure and simple absence, for there logic could make its claim, but a certain absence." (ED 133/113)

[94] For a similar interpretation of the place of "Violence and Metaphysics" in the evolution of Derrida's thought, see Bernasconi, "The Trace of Levinas in Derrida."

[95] See my citation from *Paper Machine* in the introduction to this chapter. Cf. Levinas's 1930 *Théorie de l'intuition dans la phénoménologie de Husserl* (Paris, Vrin, 1994); trans. André Orianne as *The Theory of Intuition in Husserl's Phenomenology* (Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 1995). For a fascinating examination of Levinas's treatment of the Living Present, see John Drabinski's article "The Hither-Side of the Living-Present in Levinas and Husserl," *Philosophy Today* 40,1 (1996): 142-150.

[96] Of course, Deleuze is also critical of the subject-object characterization of the plane of immanence, see "Immanence: A Life" (in DF) and §4.2.

[97] One could also develop a similar argument with reference to Derrida's discussion of invention and of deconstruction as the preparing of a place "to let the other come, *come in*." (P1 53/39) As he writes elsewhere, "for there to be an event and a history, a 'come' must be open and addressed to someone, *to someone else whom I cannot and must not determine in advance – not as subject, self, consciousness, or even as animal, God or person, man or woman, living or nonliving*... The one, *who*ever it is to whom 'come' is said, cannot let him/herself be determined in advance." (NII 94-5*e*) See Derrida's study of Levinas's hesitation as to whether the animal, particularly the snake, has a face. As I am always the second one on the scene, after other lives on earth (which is not only a question of evolutionary history), "morality, ethics, the relation to the other, is not only coming after the other, helping oneself after the other, but after the other *whoever it may be*." (BS1 319/239)

[98] ED, 183/155.

[99] Compare, for example, the dual transcendence of the Living Present in the hyletic impression and in originary temporalization in §2.1.1.

[100] ED, 180/153, 135/115. Levinas also directs this charge against what he calls 'ontological violence' in Heidegger. It's important to recall that the question of Being and history lend their name to Derrida's seminar on Heidegger contemporaneous with the publication of "Violence and Metaphysics." I will pursue the reflections on history begun in "Genesis and Structure" and *The Origin of Geometry* in §3.2.1 and §3.2.2.

[101] See, for example, Derrida's remarks on spacing as the becoming-time of space and the becoming-space of time.

[102] ED, 182/154. But, of course, a non-dialectical mediation, as I noted in Derrida's "Alterities" in §1.3.2.

[103] ED, 158/133. Or absolute evil, as Derrida puts it in *Spectres of Marx* "which is, is it not, absolute life, fully present life, the one that does not know death and does not want to hear about it." (SM, 278/220)

[104] ED, 184/157, 151/127. Note, of course, my references to tr- movements as those interrupting economy.

[105] See my discussion of "Form and Fashion" in §1.3.2.

[106] The question of writing, as it is developed in the *Introduction*, however, is much more close to what Derrida would later call writing in the narrow sense than what he would later develop as arche-writing.

[107] ED, 147/119.

[108]"Infinite différance, God or death," he would later write *Of Grammatology*. DG, 191/131.

[109] On the exclusive conferment of Levinasian transcendence upon the human, see PDS 293/279, 298/283, as well as AS, *passim*.

[110] VP, 4-5/5-6, 8/8, MP, 17/16.

[111] VP, 37/29, 111/85.

[112] VP, 5/6.

[113] Recall my remarks on the stricture in *Glas* in §1.2.2, "constrain[ing] the discourse to place the nontranscendental, the outside of the transcendental field, the excluded, in the structuring position. The matrix in question constitutes the excluded as transcendental of the transcendental." (G 340/244)

[114] See my citation of PG, 239/148 in §2.1.1 above.

[115] DG, 91/62.

[116] But of course, the transcendences of Time and the Other and their contamination of the immanence of transcendental subjectivity was noted as early as *The Problem of Genesis*. "The theme of a transcendental intersubjectivity setting up *transcendence at the heart of the absolute immanence* of the 'ego' has already been called for. The last foundation of the objectivity of intentional consciousness is not the intimacy of the 'I' to itself but [is] Time or the Other, those two forms of an existence that is irreducible to an essence [and] foreign to the

theoretical subject, [two forms] always constituted before it, but at the same time, the only conditions of a possibility of a constitution of self and of an appearance of self." (PG 126/66*e*)
[117] VP, 40/31.
[118] VP, 92/71.
[119] As Derrida writes earlier, one cannot think the trace "without thinking the retention of difference within a structure of reference where difference appears *as such*... the absence of *another* here-and-now, of another transcendental present, of *another* origin of the world appearing as such, presenting itself as irreducible absence within the presence of the trace." (DG 68/47)
[120] DG, 98/67, 97/66.
[121] DG, 103/70.
[122] Derrida recalls Levinas here, as well as Freud and Nietzsche.
[123] VP 94n1/72n.
[124] VP, 94n1/72n.
[125] VP, 77/59.
[126] This passage is indeed taken a little out of context, but ties together the questions of pity for suffering beings, death, and the human-animal binary in a discussion of Rousseau. The animal for Rousseau, Derrida writes, "cannot open itself, by the awakening of pity, to the suffering of the other as other; and on the other hand that it cannot exceed itself towards death. Indeed, the animal does have a potential faculty of pity, but it imagines neither the suffering of the other *as such* not the passage from suffering to *death*. Indeed, that is one and the same limit... That which is lacking in what Rousseau calls the animal is the ability to live its suffering as the suffering of another and as the threat of death." (DG 265/187). Of course, it is precisely this suffering as a non-power which would occupy so much of Derrida's discussion in AS.
[127] VP, 44/34.
[128] The quote continues: "Metaphor would be forbidden." (DG 103/71) This last sentence is a little enigmatic, however, one can see in *Voice and Phenomenon* that Derrida follows Husserl's description of the constituting flux of absolute subjectivity as something for which we lack names through the very concept of metaphor. "Temporalization is the root of a metaphor that can only be originary. The word 'time' itself, such as it has always been understood in the history of metaphysics, is a metaphor that indicates and dissimulates *at the same time* the 'movement' of this auto-affection." (VP 95/73) See also the discussion in TS, 68-9 on the difficulty of naming this flux.
[129] DG, 441-2/313.
[130] VP, 60/46. See also Tran Duc Thao's definition of the Living Present as always and irreducibly mine from Husserl's C manuscripts in my discussion above.
[131] Even adding, in a later discussion, "we understand the 'I am' from the 'I am dead.'" (VP 108/83)
[132] DG, 59/39.
[133] DG, 99/68.
[134] DG, 411/291, 88/60.
[135] See especially Chapter 1, note 17.
[136] DG, 236/165. It will be important to contrast this remark with Heidegger's treatment of auto-affection. If the auto-affection of time by itself corresponds to authentic ecstatico-horizonal temporalization, only human Dasein can have a relation to time *as such*. See §3.1.3.
[137] One could also multiply the implications of this discourse with reference to Deleuze's treatment of Spinoza, (*Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza*, and *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*) where the ethics of 'what a body can do' are also determined by its capacity to be affected, its 'puissance d'agir et de pâtir,' and its 'pouvoir d'être affecté.' Indeed, this conjunction of ethics and ontology will serve as an important point of comparison with Derrida's. See §4.2.1 below.
[138] See also VP, 89/68.
[139] MP, 188/158, VP, 70/53.
[140] "Which would have it that the outside be inside, that the other and the lack come to add themselves as a plus that replaces a minus, that what adds itself to something takes the place of a default in the thing, that the default, as the outside of the inside, should be already within the inside, etc." (DG 308/315)
[141] This is how, for example, one can also understand différance as "the formation of form. But it is *on the other hand* the being-imprinted of the imprint." (DG 92/63)
[142] SQ, 131.
[143] SM, 246/193.

[144] The expression is in fact Derrida's, see PDS, 282/268, how the post-deconstructive responsibility of the subject is to be articulated through the Heideggerean *Zusage* will be the chief concern of my next chapter.
[145] V, 175/124.
[146] VP, 114/87.
[147] V, 179/127.
[148] Derrida also speaks of unconditional hospitality in terms of the Idea in the Kantian sense. DH, 131/149.

Notes to chapter three: Resistance and Ex-Appropriation
[1] "Das Sein, die φύσις, ist als Walten ursprüngliche Gesammeltheit: λόγος, ist fügender Fug, δίκη."
[2] See §1.2.2 above. Cf. also NG, 260/25: "the remainder, the *remaining* (*restance*) of the remainder, the relationship between Being, beings, and the remainder, and a certain irreducibility, it seems to me, of what I have called the remaining of the remainder of all 'ontology.' This heterogeneity and the law of contamination between the wholly other of this heterogeneity and its regular reappropriation (inclusion/exclusion, *economic* redialectization, and so on.)"
[3] For example, when Derrida writes that the mechanical "*at the same time detaches from and reattaches to* the family (*heimisch*, homely), to the familiar, to the domestic, to the proper, to the *oikos* of the ecological and of the economic, to the *ethos*, to the place of dwelling... at the same time ex-propriates and re-appropriates, de-racinates and re-enracinates, *ex-appropriates*." (FS 78/64) With respect to the proper of man, "the 'logic' of the trace or of différance determines this re-appropriation as ex-appropriation. Re-appropriation necessarily produces the opposite of what it aims for. Ex-appropriation is not what is proper to man. One can recognize its differential figures as soon as there is a relation to self in its most elementary form (but for this very reason there is no such thing as elementary... [Ex-appropriation] no longer closes itself; it never totalizes itself... ex-appropriation does not form a boundary, if one understands by this word a closure or a negativity. It implies the irreducibility of the relation to the other." (PDS 283-5/269-270) Ex-appropriation, he writes elsewhere, "applies... to everything, to capital, to the economy in general." (FSC 24)
[4] See §1.3.2 above. cf. also FF, 16 on the 'survivance' of formalism in Heidegger's destruction of ontology.
[5] The passage through Heidegger in my discussions of Deleuze and Foucault will be necessary; Derrida often faults the latter two for not sufficiently taking Heidegger's work into account. See his discussion in NG, 256/21-2, also CH, 76-7.
[6] I'll devote some space to demonstrating this below in §3.2.4, but this discussion should be quite familiar to anyone interested in the work of Derrida and the other-than-human. See for example A, AS, BS1 and 2, DE, "The Ends of Man" in MP, "Eating Well" in PDS. Excellent secondary literature also exists on the relation of Derrida to animals passing by way of Heidegger, see for example Matthew Calarco, *Zoographies: The Question of the Animal from Heidegger to Derrida* (New York, Columbia University Press, 2008), and David Farrell Krell, *Derrida and our Animal Others: Derrida's Final Seminar, 'The Beast and the Sovereign'* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2013) I won't fully reiterate these discussions, however, and will choose to focus on the questions of resistance and ex-appropriation in my title.
[7] See, for example, David R. Keller's division of the textbook *Environmental Ethics: The Big Questions* (West Sussex,Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), vi-vii into the more axiologically/analytically based part IV, "What is the Scope of Moral Considerability" and part V, "What are the Prominent Alternatives to Grounding Environmental Ethics in Axiology. Keller further divides this category between traditionalists and progressivists, the latter "took the position that the traditional moral categories of mainstream Western ethics, rooted in ontologies of individualism, are *not* up to the task of grounding an environmental ethic and must be abandoned." Ibid., 9.
[8] See §1.4.2, DJ, 33-4, as well as SM, 16-18/xviii-xx.
[9] GA *9*, 353/268.
[10] Heidegger does not say so here. On this, see Michael Marder's "Ecology as an Event" in *Eco-Deconstruction.*
[11] As Derrida writes in his 1964-5 seminar *Heidegger: The Question of Being and History*, "he says nothing else, he does not propose another ontology... it's a destruction – that is, a deconstruction, a de-structuration, the shaking that is necessary to bring out the structures, the strata, the system of deposits." (HQ 34/9) Derrida traces the distancing from ontology as occurring from *Being and Time,* to the *Introduction to Metaphysics*, to "Nietzsche's Word: God is Dead," and finally to the "Letter on Humanism." HQ, 40-48/13-19. With respect to ontology, Derrida writes in "We Other Greeks," "I have nothing against ontology, but I have never had toward what presents itself under this name anything but questions, reservations, very conditional hypotheses, interminable parentheses." (NG 259/24) But what Derrida will later develop as 'hauntology' with respect to survivance and revenance will exceed these: "this question would be a question of life or death, the question of life-death, before being a question of Being, of essence, or of

existence. It would open onto a dimension of irreducible *sur-vival* or *surviving* [survivance] and onto Being and onto some opposition between living and dying." (SM 235-6/185) I'll discuss survivance as the returning of a revenance in my discussions of Nietzsche's Eternal Return in §4.4.3.

[12] GA *40*, 11/15.

[13] Derrida takes up this point from the "Letter on Humanism" a 1975-6 seminar entitled *Théorie et pratique*. I reserve a detailed examination of this seminar for a later project.

[14] GA *9*, 358-9/272.

[15] Derrida also discusses "Building, Dwelling, Thinking" in the second year of his *La Chose* seminar on Blanchot and Heidegger. I'll be reading this seminar in conjunction with *Théorie et pratique* in another project.

[16] As I've shown, however, Heidegger's emphasis on death as the possibility of an impossibility, as one's ownmost and proper possibility, is insufficient for Blanchot and Levinas, who intend to think it as the impossibility of a possibility. I'll turn to these discussions in Derrida's *Aporias* below.

[17] "*If* there was a dramatic 'turn' of this sort in Heidegger's career of thought (and I underscore the 'if' and embrace the subjunctive), then it would be a turn, not from man to Being, but from the neutral designation *Da-sein* to *homo humanus*, to *des Mensch*, *die Sterblichen*; in other words, a turn from Being to Man." Krell, *Intimations of Mortality: Time, Truth, and Finitude in Heidegger's Thinking of Being* (University Park, Pennsylvania University Press, 1986), 29.

[18] See David Farrell Krell's exemplary *Daimon Life: Heidegger and Life-Philosophy* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1992), and more recently Scott M. Campbell, *The Early Heidegger's Philosophy of Life: Facticity, Being, and Language* (New York, Fordham University Press, 2012).

[19] GA *20*, 293/214, 303/220.

[20] GA *2*, 211/254.

[21] GA *2*, 366/418.

[22] As he puts it, "world understanding as Dasein-understanding is self-understanding. Self and world belong together in the single entity that is the Dasein. Self and world are not two beings, the subject or the object, or the I and the thou, but self and world are the basic determination of the Dasein itself in the unity of the structure of Being-in-the-world." (GA *24* 422/297)

[23] GA *24*, 423/298.

[24] This notion of Dasein as World-Forming [*weltbildend*] is abysmally separated from the animal, which is poor in the world [*Das Tier ist weltarm*] and the stone, which has no world. Derrida will return to these three theses from *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* throughout his engagement with Heidegger, all the way to his final seminar, *The Beast and the Sovereign*.

[25] GA *20*, 133-6/97-9. *Die Welt ist fort*, as I showed Derrida comment on the *epokhè* above, and will soon bring him into direct conversation with Heidegger. (See my discussions in §2.1.2 and §2.3.2, as well as Derrida's discussion in *Sovereignties in Question*, taken up again in the *Beast and the Sovereign* seminars.)

As Derrida writes, "difficult problems that perhaps presuppose a simplification of Husserl's intentions and especially of the methodological meaning of the reduction and of the non-worldliness of the ego. But I cannot and do not wish to get into that here." (HQ 184/121) Derrida refers here to an as-yet unpublished lecture course from 1963-4 "The Fifth of the *Cartesian Meditations*," concerning Husserl and Heidegger's *Mitsein*. Moreover, what is perhaps also at stake here, so essential for Derrida's reading of Husserl and Heidegger, and Levinas's reading of these two in "Violence and Metaphysics," is that Pure Being comes down to Pure Nothingness. (And along with it, pure non-violence is pure violence, the absolute other is the same, and so on.) In recognizing, as Husserl does, that pure consciousness as pure Being is in fact nothing, has the question of Being not in a sense been raised? Heidegger does not seem to think so, remarking that the pure idealism of the *epokhe* seems to neglect the question of Being.

[26] "*Nulla re indiget ad existendum*… 'it needs no *res* in order to be.' Res is here understood in the narrower sense of *reality, transcendent being*, that is, every entity which is not consciousness." (GA *20* 141-2/103)

[27] GA *24*, 425/299.

[28] "Transcendence is rather the primordial constitution of the *subjectivity* of a subject. The subject transcends qua subject; it would not be a subject if it did not transcend. To be a subject means to transcend." (GA *26* 211/165)

[29] GA *24*, 418/295.

[30] GA *20*, 335/243. See Derrida's discussion in FP, 27 and the conclusion to §2.1.2.

[31] GA *9*, 31/106.

[32] Freedom, as he puts it in "On the Essence of Truth," "now reveals itself as letting beings be." GA *9*, 188/144.

[33] GA *40*, 11/15, GA *9*, 189-90/145.

[34] Note Heidegger's use of the word '*Walten*' here.

[35] GA *26*, 246-7/191. Indeed, one imagines the need to move beyond a distinction between reaction and response in this passage.
[36] GA *40*, 16/23.
[37] GA *9*, 190/145.
[38] "The world is the free counter-hold of Dasein's for-the-sake-of. Being-in-the-world is accordingly nothing other than freedom, freedom is no longer understood as spontaneity but as defined by the formulation of Dasein's metaphysical essence." (GA *26*, 248/192)
[39] GA *26*, 277/214. See also chapters 6 and 7 in François Raffoul's *The Origins of Responsibility*. (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2010)
[40] See also Derrida's discussion against the idea of the 'reste' as 'objectalisation' in PV, 106.
[41] FF, 16, 10-11.
[42] For another discussion of this, see Heidegger's "On the Essence and Concept of *Phusis* in Aristotle's Physics B,1" GA *9*.
[43] GA *24*, 164/116.
[44] FF, 16.
[45] On the question of enframing, see Butler, *Frames of War*, and for a detailed examination of the biopolitical aspects of these questions, Wolfe, *Before the Law*. I'll return to this question of biopolitics in chapter 5, where the question of biopower as making live and letting die and its opposition in sovereign power, letting live and making die, are both superseded in the question of letting live-on, anterior to the opposition of activity and passivity.
[46] An analysis of Heidegger's *Nietzsche* lectures on this subject forms the second 'boucle' of Derrida's *Life Death* seminar. I'll turn to it at length in §4.1.
[47] HQ, 203/134.
[48] GA *24*, 230/162.
[49] GA *26*, 170/135.
[50] GA *2*, 137/176.
[51] GA *2*, 137/176. I showed above in Heidegger's critique of Scheler that "the pressure and counterpressure, thrust and counterthrust, of material things can never allow something like a world in the sense of worldhood to come into being. Instead, *resistance is a phenomenal character which already presupposes world*." (GA *20* 304/222)
[52] GA *20*, 96/70.
[53] As Heidegger explains, "the so-called epistemological positions of *idealism* and *realism* and their varieties and mixtures are all possible only on the basis of a lack of clarity of the phenomenon of In-Being." (GA *20* 224-5/166)
[54] GA *40*, 106/77, 46/63, 139/195.
[55] GA *24*, 149/106, 151/107.
[56] As Derrida writes in "Form and Meaning," whether the meaning of Being has been limited by the imposition of form, in its determination as presence, or whether form has been limited by the determination of Being as presence, both in fact come down to the same. But in repeating this circularity, one can "let some *elliptical* displacement be produced in the difference of a repetition... Neither matter nor form, nothing that could be recast by some philosopheme, that is, by some dialectics." (MP 207/173)
[57] See PM, 376/143-4. For the full citation, see the introduction to chapter 2.
[58] As mentioned in note 43 of chapter 2, Derrida credits Heidegger for many of the propositions in *The Problem of Genesis*. See also Edward Baring's study of Heidegger's influence on the very young Derrida in Baring, *The Young Derrida and French Philosophy*.
[59] GA *2*, 17/38, 250-1/294.
[60] "An external or intrinsic truncation of life, a contingent snipping of the thread." Krell, *Daimon Life*, 93.
[61] As Krell explains in *Daimon Life*, however, the principle of immanent death, in Simmel, Korschelt, Bernstein, Weismann and Freud challenges this very notion of death as *Verenden,* "defeats the very language of inside and outside. In fact, it is almost as though *Lebensphilosophie* here confronts the central difficulty of deconstruction, grappling with it long before the *domain* of deconstruction – to wit, the metaphysics of presence – has been staked out by Heidegger's philosophy. The very opposition of life and death comes to an end in the idea of immanent death." Krell, *Daimon Life*, 93. This is quite true, but only if the immanence of death is not understood, as Derrida shows in "To Speculate...," according to the reappropriative (indeed restricted) economy and ecology of the Living Present as described by Husserl in the *Vorlesungen* or the auto-affective temporalization described by Heidegger in the *Kantbuch*, as I showed in chapters 1 and 2. See especially chapter 1, notes 16 and 145.
[62] Resolute anticipation, "unlike inauthentic Being-towards-death, does not evade the fact that death is not to be outstripped, instead; anticipation frees itself *for* accepting this." (GA *2*, 263/308)

[63] On the question of "Choosing one's Heritage," in Derrida, see the interview of the same title in DQ, as well as SM, and my discussion in §4.4.3.
[64] GA *2*, 310/357.
[65] GA *2*, 325/372.
[66] GA *24*, 377/266.
[67] "Only in so far as Dasein *is* as an 'I-*am*-as-having-been,' can Dasein come towards itself futurally in such a way that it comes *back*. As authentically futural, Dasein *is* authentically as '*having-been.*'" (GA *2* 325/373) For Derrida, resoluteness in Heidegger is not to live the present as in the Pure Form of the Living Present but to constitute the present as the past of a future.
[68] GA *2*, 326/374.
[69] In his book *Intimations of Mortality*, Krell writes that "to the self-generating ecstatic unity of temporality Heidegger gives the names 'animation' and 'vibrancy' (*Schwung, Schwingung*), relating these words to the Bergsonian *élan* and to the *Wurf* of *Geworfenheit* and *Entwurf*." Krell, *Intimations of Mortality*, 59. As he adds in a footnote, "the reference reminds us how indebted Heidegger's analysis of 'ecstatic temporality' is to Henri Bergson – *infinitely more so than to the time-consciousness of Husserl*." Ibid., 182, n.7. Of course, there exist many similarities between the Husserl of the *Lectures* on internal time consciousness and Bergson in distinguishing between the time of clocks and duration in the Living Present. I will show in §4.2.3 that when Deleuze refers to a past that has never been present, he refers to Bergson and not Levinas. Unfortunately, I don't have the space here to examine Bergson's work at all. Derrida never published anything on him, however, certain lectures that may one day be published include a 1960-1 seminar on the Present (on Heidegger, Aristotle, Kant, Hegel and Bergson), a 1961-2 lecture on entitled *Bergson: Introduction to Metaphysics*, and a similar 1963-4 course *Bergson: Introduction to Metaphysics and The Idea of Nothingness.*
[70] GA *2*, 328/377.
[71] "The existential-temporal condition for the possibility of world lies in the fact that temporality, as an ecstatical unity, has something like a horizon." GA *2*, 365/316.
[72] GA *2*, 366/418.
[73] Heidegger here so closely evokes certain passages in Blanchot that will be taken up by Deleuze, Foucault and Esposito. See my chapters 4 and 5, passim.
[74] "The distinction between being and beings is temporalized in the temporalizing of temporality." (GA *24* 454/319) Earlier in *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, he notes that "the transcendence of Being-in-the-world is founded in its specific wholeness on the ecstatico-horizonal unity of temporality. If transcendence makes possible the understanding of being and if transcendence is founded on the ecstatico-horizonal constitution of temporality, then temporality is the condition of the possibility of the understanding of Being." (GA *24* 429/302)
[75] Cf. GA *2*, 329-30/378. This question of the dual finitude of life and of experience, knowledge and interpretation, which Krell calls the "two voices of finitude" (in Krell, *Intimations of Mortality*, 42) is also beautifully discussed by Wolfe in *What is Posthumanism*. After recalling the radical passivity and vulnerability in death, Wolfe draws on a second kind of finitude from Derrida's critique of Lacan. "That second form of finitude derives from the fundamental exteriority and materiality of meaning and communication itself, of any form of semiotic marking and iterability to which both humans and nonhuman animals are subject in a trace structure that, as [Derrida] puts it, exceeds and encompasses the human/animal difference and indeed 'the life/death' relation itself. For this reason, we cannot master and 'erase,' in any analytic of finitude or existential of being-toward-death (as in Heidegger), our radical passivity in a way that would once again separate us, definitively and ontologically, from nonhuman animals." Wolfe, *What is Posthumanism?*, xxviii. Wolfe's analyses are in agreement with my own intentions here, and I will especially return to them in my discussion of translation and science in §6.2.2.
[76] GA *26*, 256/198, GA *3*, 91/62.
[77] Krell, *Intimations of Mortality*, 51.
[78] PE, 18/9.
[79] Adding, in a 2000 interview in *Paper Machine*, that "not only am I not a disciple of Heidegger's, but for forty years I have never made a reference to him that was not also questioning, not to say critical or deconstructive." (PM 383/149)
[80] IOG, 171/153.
[81] See Heidegger's 'The Age of the World Picture' in GA *5*, 75-114/57-85.
[82] HQ, 199-201/131-3.
[83] HQ, 178/116.
[84] GA *2*, 382/434.

[85] HQ, 202/133-4, 184-5/120-2.
[86] HQ, 185/121, 206/136.
[87] HQ, 185/122. "Even in a phenomenology that determines the Being of beings as an object in general for a subject in general… the interminable genetic (so-called passive) analyses of the ego, of time and of the alter ego lead back to a pre-egological and pre-subjectivist zone. There is, therefore, at the heart of what passes for and presents itself as a transcendental idealism, a horizon of questioning that is no longer dictated by the egological form of subjectivity or of intersubjectivity." (PDS 277/263)
[88] QP 50-1/46-7. Of course, Deleuze and Guattari's notion of immanence also resists that of phenomenological immanence; the immanence of the transcendental and the empirical. Indeed, I'll show in §4.2.2 and §4.2.3, as they both draw from Blanchot, it is the Outside itself. It is precisely in this sense that I understand the logic of the beyond-within, the *pas au-delà* I discussed in §1.2.2, so transcendence within immanence in another sense than the immanence of the transcendental and the empirical.
[89] HQ, 185-6/122.
[90] "The Living Present is the phenomenological absolute out of which I can never exit because it is that within which, towards which, and starting from which every exit is effectuated." (IOG 149/136*t*) Even as a thought of originary difference, the dialectic of the living present operates in "the powerlessness to remain enclosed in the innocent undividedness [*indivision*] of the originary Absolute, because it is *present* only in *deferring* itself without respite, this powerlessness and this impossibility are given in an originary and pure consciousness of Difference." (IOG 171/153*t*)
[91] HQ, 212/140-1.
[92] The determination of Being as presence in classical metaphysics would have rendered the thinking of history impossible, and along with it, "the *origin* and the end, birth and death as such; as such: namely, as being unable to appear in the form of presence or appearing as what cannot appear." (HQ 214/142)
[93] Both Husserl and Heidegger, I showed in §2.1.2, understand appearing and dissimulation are originary and complicit possibilities. IOG, 151n1/138n164. "This summation or this reduction of history in the Present... is the very form of historialization that is constituted by dissimulating itself in the very *presence* of appearing. In the present, history is erased or summed up and that dissimulation resounds in philosophical discourse *qua* metaphysics of the Living Present." (HQ 213/142)
[94] MP, 147/123.
[95] HQ, 52/22.
[96] Particularly, Derrida adds here, as concerns the concepts of *Schuldigsein* and *Bezeugung* (originary guilt/culpability and attestation, witnessing). I unfortunately don't have the space to devote an analysis to these concepts. Derrida himself develops an examination of *Schuldigsein* in the unpublished seventh session of *Donner le temps*, seemingly inserted into the centre of the lecture after its first rendition.
[97] In classical metaphysics, "man's being (*Menschsein*) remains (*bleibt*) defined by life and life experience [*Leben und Erleben:* experience, then, *Erlebnis* as experience but, as the word suggests, lived experience of the living being]." (BS2 185/124)
[98] HQ, 276/188.
[99] See GA *2*, 38/62, and also Derrida's reference to this in MP, 157n18/131n34.
[100] But, as I showed from the "Letter on Humanism," both ethics and ontology, as derivative from letting-be, are incapable of thinking the poetic Saying [*sage*], the language that is the house of Being, the *Zusage*, unless of course these terms undergo a total refiguration of their sense.
[101] ED, 118/98.
[102] ED, 146/122, 155/131.
[103] "Calls upon us to depart from Greek site, and perhaps from the site in general, toward what is no longer a source or a site... below every Greek origin, towards the other of the Greek... A thought for which the entirety of the Greek logos has already irrupted, [humus apaisé non pas sur un sol, mais autour d'un volcan plus ancien]" (ED 122/102)
[104] ED, 123/102.
[105] ED, 144/120.
[106] ED, 132/110.
[107] ED 144/97.
[108] ED, 200/170, 202/172.
[109] "The επεκειμα τες ουσιας (in Levinas's interpretation) would not lead beyond Being itself, but beyond the totality of beings or the beingness of the being (the Being being of the being) or beyond ontic history." (ED 208-9/177*t*)
[110] ED, 218/183.

[111] DG, 103/70.
[112] PV, 105-6.
[113] DG, 103/70, 347/244. "This proper [*propre*] of man is not the proper of man: it is the very dislocation of... the proper in general, the impossibility – and therefore the desire – of self-proximity; the impossibility and therefore the desire of pure presence." The proper of the human will be revealed to be constituted by a logic of supplementarity, as I examined in my discussions of life death in Freud and Jacob in §1.1.1, guaranteeing both its condition of possibility – its life and thus its desire to purify itself by drawing limits between itself and animality, primitivism, childhood, madness and divinity – but also the impossibility of its purity, propriety and self-presence, which it threatens as their originary finitude.
[114] As Derrida adds, here "and on the basis of this unfolding of the same as *différance*, we see announced the sameness of *différance* and repetition in the eternal return." (MP 18-9/17) I will return to this in §4.4.3.
[115] MP, 29/27.
[116] As I cited in chapter 1, translation as Derrida draws from Heidegger is "an operation of thought through which we must translate ourselves into the thought of the other language, the forgotten thinking of the other language; we must translate ourselves into it, not make it come into our language but, on the contrary, go toward the unthought thinking of the other language." (OA 152/115*t*) This will have very important implications for my discussions of ecolinguistics and biocultural diversity in chapter 6. On the question of an experience without Erlebnis, cf. PV*,* 68-74.
[117] Compare, on this subject, the 6th and 7th sessions of HQ.
[118] Although citing it in a footnote in *Given Time*, Derrida mentions in the interview with Janicaud, that he read the *Beitrage* but not seriously enough, for which he feels guilty. HF, 351. Cf. also DT, 33/19, P, 36/25 for Derrida's translations. As Derrida cites Heidegger, "Beyng is the *appropriating event...* Beyng is – that means beyng alone essentially occurs its own essence (event) [*das Seyn west allein das Wesen seiner selbst (Ereignis)]."* (GA *65* 470-473/369-372) Earlier, "Beyng essentially occurs as the event [*Das Seyn west als Ereignis*]." (GA *65* 28-30/25)
[119] "Only as long as Dasein *is*... 'is there' Being [*'gibt es' Sein*]." (GA *2* 212/255)
[120] DT, 36/22.
[121] DT, 45/29.
[122] SM 15-6/xviii, see also my remarks on the promise of the earth concerning ontology and auto-affective temporalization in §1.4.2, with reference to AV, 29.
[123] SM, 55/32.
[124] Heidegger "skew[s] the asymmetry *in favour* of what he in effect interprets as the possibility of *favor* itself, of the accorded favour, namely, of the accord that gathers or collects while harmonizing (*Versammlung, Fug*)." (SM, 55/32)
[125] SM, 57/34. Cf. also FS, 37 n.11/60 n.15, EA, 20. "'The relation to others – that is to say justice,' writes Levinas." (SM 48-9/25) "As soon as justice implies a relation to an-other, it supposes an interruption, a dis-joining, a disjunction or being-out-of-joint, which is not negative; an out-of-jointness that is not deconstructible, that is justice as deconstruction." (NII 230) As he writes elsewhere, again against this *Versammlung,* "at the heart of justice, of the *experience of the just*, an infinite disjunction demands its right, and the respect of an irreducible dissociation: no justice without interruption, without divorce, without a dislocated relation to the infinite alterity of the other, without a harsh experience of what remains forever *out of joint*." (DQ 135/81)
[126] Cf. MPD, 140-1/146. Derrida refers here to Martin Heidegger, *Was Heisst Denken* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 2002); trans. J. Glenn Gray as *What is Called Thinking?* (New York, Perennial, 2004) and *Zur Sache des Denkens* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 2007); trans. Joan Stambaugh as *On Time and Being* (New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1972).
[127] HF, 357.
[128] See on this point Derrida's contrasting of Heidegger's image of the bridge in Building Dwelling Thinking with the philosophy of Blanchot in the second year of *La Chose*. I'll discuss this in a new project.
[129] SM, 58/35.
[130] See Wolfe, *Before the Law*, 58.
[131] BS1, 90/56.
[132] See my note 6 above.
[133] On time, see AS 42/22, 197/144, see also PV, 90; the other, BS2, 288/204; the material world and death 'as such,' A, AS, BS2, DE *passim*; the inability to let beings be beyond its vital design, AS, 219/160. "Transcendence in the sense of projecting oneself in order to relate to beings as such, as beings. This is the movement of Dasein's *Verhalten...* of Dasein relating to beings of such, beyond and transcending what encircles the animal in its drives or

its appetites. The animal does not transcend, as does Dasein, and the movement of transcendence is indeed that on the basis of which one has a world as totality of beings as such." (BS2 315/226)

[134] BS2, 387/285. *Walten*, he writes, produces nothing less than the ontological difference... "i.e. everything that is going to organize more or less indirectly this seminar on the difference between man, between human *Dasein,* and the animal: the animal is unable to accede to the *as such* of beings, i.e. the difference between Being and beings." (BS2 160/105)

[135] BS2, 36/12-3.

[136] Recalling that Dasein's transcendence is being-in-the-world, Derrida defines the world as "the whole in so far as we are this path on the way toward it, but toward it insofar as the path traces itself in it, breaks itself in it, opens itself in it, inscribes itself in it." (BS2 155/101)

[137] BS2, 155-6/101-2.

[138] "The word *idea*, *eidos*, 'idea,' comes to the fore as the definitive and prevailing word for *phusis*." (GA *40* 137/192)

[139] "Ideology (*eidos* plus *logos*) and idealism are not innocent, one must recognize their violence. It is through war that idealism too imposed its interpretation of Being, a war for the victory of an idea, of the idea of idea, of the intelligible as *eidos*, i.e. as visible object." (BS2 396/290)

[140] AS, 40/20.

[141] BS2, 105/63.

[142] "*Der* nächste Weg *zu einer ersten Klärung*." (cited in BS2 101/61)

[143] "Not a prevalence or hierarchizing valorization among others, but rather the prevailing of every evaluation and every possible hierarchy, the *pre*-ferring of *pre*-ferance [*pré-férance,* with an 'a'] itself, that is, the pre-archic originarity of the proper, the authentic, and the *eigentlich*." (A 103-4/56)

[144] AS, 51-2/29-30.

[145] A, 121/68.

[146] BS2, 31/8.

[147] BS2, 160/105.

[148] "Where there is no world, where the world is not here or there, but *fort*, infinitely distant over there, that what I must do, with you and carrying you, is make it that there be precisely a world, if not a just world, or to do things so as to make it *as if* there were a world, and to make the world come to the world, to make as if – for you, to give it to you, to bear it toward you, destined for you, to address it to you – I made the world come into the world, as though there ought to be a world where presently there is none, to make the gift or present of this *as if* come up poetically, which is the only thing that – during the finite time of such an impossible voyage between two non-shores where nothing happens – the only thing that can make it possible that I can live and have or let you live." (BS2 369-70/268)

[149] In fact, the first engagement of Celan's line I can find is in Levinas on Blanchot's *Madness of the Day*, warning against the interpretation of this carrying where "the other [*autrui*], the only point of access to an outside, is closed... The idea of bearing the other, suffering in him (Celan's sublime expression, "The world is no more, I shall have to carry you") turns into a comedy in an insane asylum, in which the patients have fun taking rides on the back of the narrator, on all fours. The transcendence of the intersubjective is oppression in the highest degree, an altruism stultifying. The *I* suffocates in its dray-horse being." Emmanuel Levinas, *Sur Maurice Blanchot* (Montpellier, Fata Morgana, 1975); trans. Michael B. Smith as "On Maurice Blanchot" in *Proper Names* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1996), 72/169. In other words, a reading that would think ethics as the carrying of a burden, not unlike Zarathustra's donkey, and the repetition of its 'yes, yes' I-A, I-A. But must any carrying not risk this reactivity? Is this repetition, and the possibility of the repetition of the worst not rather the very possibility of ethics? I'll turn to this in chapter 4.

[150] AS, 49/28. "It is from this compassion in impotence and not from power that we must start when we want to think the animal and its relation to man." BS2, 339/244.

[151] Although, Derrida writes, the Zusage can in fact be understood as running through Heidegger's entire *oeuvre*, through the concepts of *Bezeugung* and *Schuldigsein* I mentioned above, the *Gewissen* and the *Entschlossenheit*. FS, 92/95-6. To this list, he adds the *Rufsinn*, the *Verlässlichkeit,* the *Versprechen* or *Verheissen*, see DE, 118 n1/133n. 5.

[152] PDS, 282/268.

[153] DE, 115n1/129n5.

[154] On this non-logical and non-chronological anteriority, see DP /442, HF, 348-9.

[155] The 'already' of the Zusage "say[s] something of the essence of this *parole* and of what en-gages in it. At the moment when, in the present, it entrusts or addresses itself to us, it has *already* done so, and this past never returns, never again becomes present, it always goes back to an older event which will have already engaged us in this subscribing to the en-gage." (DE 120n1/135n6)
[156] "The relation to self, in this situation, can only be différance, that is to say alterity or trace. Not only is the obligation not lessened in this situation, but on the contrary it finds in it its only possibility, which is neither subjective nor human." (PDS 275-6/261)
[157] P2, 246/238.
[158] MP, 18-19/17.

Notes to chapter four: Animmanence: Life Death & The Passion and Perpetual Detour of Difference
[1] I'll return to this in more detail in the introduction chapter 5. Let me simply cite for now Lawlor's summarization of the similarities between Heidegger's reading of the Will to Power and Foucault's biopower, "First, both conceptions occur in the modern epoch, which is the epoch of anti-Platonism. Second, both conceptions, being modern, imply a transformation of vision into positing and constant presence. Third, bio-power and will to power are commanding, meaning that the will in each conception super-enhances the power it already has; bio-will to power is the will to more and more power (*super*-abundant life). Finally, both Heidegger and Foucault associate the phenomenological concept of *Erlebnis* with bio-will to power." Lawlor, *The Implications of Immanence*, 27.
[2] cited in Lawlor, *Implications of Immanence*, 43.
[3] Ibid., 3
[4] Lawlor is also quite attentive to the difference between the transcendent and transcendence here.
[5] See Lawlor's appendix I to *Early Twentieth Century Philosophy* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2012), "A Note on the Idea of Immanence."
[6] HJR, 76.
[7] Derrida's final question in fact also addresses Deleuze and Guattari's notion of the Body without Organs, which I'll examine in §4.2.2.
[8] Several of the sessions on Nietzsche have been published. The second session, "La Logique de la vivante," can be found in *Otobiographies: L'Enseignement de Nietzsche et la politique du nom propre* (Paris, Galilée, 1984) and OA. The entirety of the eighth, "Cause 'Nietzsche,'" and the first part of the ninth, "Chaos de l'interprétation," were published as "Interpreting Signatures (Nietzsche/Heidegger): Two Questions." trans. Diane Michelfelder and Richard Palmer in *Dialogue and Deconstruction: The Derrida/Gadamer Encounter* (Albany, SUNY Press, 1989). Where possible, this chapter will refer to the published texts.
[9] Cf. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols and Other Writings* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005), 75.
[10] Cf. NG, 258/24.
[11] To my knowledge, Deleuze makes only one reference to Levinas, and to a rather peripheral text, "Les Cahiers de la nuit surveillée." Cf. QP 92n5/223n5.
[12] As I'll show below, the total techno-biopolitical dominion over the earth's organic and inorganic matter and the total dominion of humans over one another are mutually reinforcing possibilities. See my discussion of Mick Smith's argument in the introduction to chapter 5. See also Martin Hägglund's discussion of immortality as 'the worst' in *Radical Atheism*, 33.
[13] As Deleuze writes, "we must not forget that the Eternal Return and the Will to Power, the two most fundamental concepts in the Nietzschean corpus, are hardly introduced at all. They never did receive the extended treatment Nietzsche intended." (ID 164/117) Blanchot reflects on their ambiguity as well in *The Work of Fire*: "Nietzsche's positive philosophy, that of the Will to power as well as that of the Overman, without speaking of the Eternal Return, remains constantly suspended... In principle, the Overman replaces God. But, finally, what does Nietzsche say about the Overman? Exactly what he says about the gods... And of the Eternal Return? 'Perhaps there is nothing true in that – let others fight about it.' And of the Will to Power? 'Power makes one stupid... power is tiresome... Would we want a world in which the action of the weak, their freedom, their reserve, their spirituality, their adaptability would be lacking?" (BPF 284/293*t*)
[14] Keith Ansell Pearson's *Germinal Life: The Difference and Repetition of Deleuze* (London, Routledge, 1999) deals with the question of life in Deleuze in far more detail than I could ever hope to here. My reading of Deleuze owes much to his study.

[15] As Derrida writes, however, "for me, Spinoza is someone I have never understood at all. I have taught him, I know something about him, I can give a course on Spinoza. But – even though he was a Portuguese Marrano, like myself – he is a thinker whose philosophical enterprise is to me the most 'foreign.'" (FSC 25)
[16] On the Eternal Return as the Perpetual Detour of Difference and the perpetual neutrality of the detour, see BEI, 413/277. On the Will to Power as the Passion of Difference, see BEI, 241/161. "But then what is the Will to Power? "*Not a being, not a becoming, but a pathos*": the passion of difference."
[17] See Heidegger's interview in *Der Spiegel*, "'Only a God Can Save Us Now': An Interview with Martin Heidegger," trans. David Schendler, *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 6, no. 1 (1977), 5–27.
[18] See David Farrell Krell's analysis in his translations of Heidegger's *Nietzsche*. Also *Intimations of Mortality*, op. cit.
[19] GA *6.1*, 156/*1*, 154.
[20] GA *6.1*, 380-1/*2*, 162.
[21] GA *6.2*, 14-5/*3* 168.
[22] GA *6.2*, 16/*3* 170, 295/219.
[23] GA *7*, 113/*2*, 222.
[24] GA *5*, 232/175-6.
[25] GA *6.1*, 33/*1*, 37.
[26] Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power* (New York, Vintage Books, 1968), §702.
[27] GA *5*, 237/177.
[28] Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, §582.
[29] Ibid., §493.
[30] GA *6.1*, 516/*3* 86.
[31] Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, §710.
[32] Cf. Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, §490.
[33] GA *6.1*, 223/*1*, 219.
[34] GA *6.1*, 579/*3* 143, 555/122.
[35] Beings as a whole, for Heidegger, designates "basically everything that is not simply nothing: nature (animate and inanimate), history (what it brings about, the personages who fill it, and those who propel it), God, the gods, and demigods. When we speak of things that are in being, we are also referring to what comes to be, what originates and passes away. For it already *is* no longer the nothing, or not yet the nothing. When we allude to things that are in being, we are also referring to appearance, illusion, deception, and falsehood. If all such things were not in being they could not delude us and make us err. All these things too are named in the phrase 'beings as a whole.'" (GA *6.1* 245/*2* 25-6)
[36] Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science, With a Prelude in German Rhymes and an Appendix of Songs* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001), 110.
[37] "Human beings, resolutely open to what is to come and preserving what has been, sustain and give shape to what is present. The thought of Eternal Return of the Same, spawned by such temporality and grounded in it, is therefore a 'human' thought in a distinctive sense – the supreme sense." (GA *6.1* 318-9/*2* 99)
[38] GA *6.1*, 270/*2*, 50.
[39] GA *5*, 223-4/167-8.
[40] GA *6.2*, 292-4/*3* 217-8.
[41] Cf. for the 'business transaction,' GA *6.1*, 583/*3*, 148. "Eine Gerechtigkeit, die es auf den *Vorteil* absieht, das klingt befremdlich und zugleich deutlich nach Nutzen, Ubervorteilung und Berechnung, wenn nicht gar nach Geschäft."
[42] GA *6.2*, 309/*3* 231.
[43] Gilles Deleuze, "Remarques" in *Nos Grecs et leurs modernes*, edited by Barbara Cassin (Paris, Seuil, 1992), 249-50. It's unclear to me in the French whether Deleuze is saying something apparently uncharacteristic of his thought (that Spinoza and Nietzsche remain Stoic Platonists) or that Spinoza and Nietzsche are philosophers of pure immanence (which seems more likely, but is not suggested in the text as presented): "Toute réaction contre le platonisme est une restauration de l'immanence en sa pleine extension. La question est de savoir si une telle réaction abandonne tout projet de séléction des rivaux, ou dresse au contraire, comme le croyait Nietzsche, des méthodes de sélection tout à fait différentes (éternel retour). Seul peut-être les philosophies de la pure immanence échappent au platonisme des Stoïciens, à Spinoza et Nietzsche."
[44] Deleuze's main works on Spinoza are *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza and Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. His key works on Nietzsche are *Nietzsche and Philosophy* and 'Nietzsche,' the latter published on its own in French

as *Nietzsche*, and included in the English collection *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life*. Not to be confused with *Nietzsche: Colloque de Royaumont*, ed. Gilles Deleuze (Paris, Minuit, 1967). Deleuze's contribution to the latter text, "Conclusions on the Will to Power and the Eternal Return" was collected in *Desert Islands* (ID), which I'll also examine here.

[45] See the note on Heidegger's philosophy of difference in *Difference and Repetition*, 89-91/64-66.

[46] NP, 7/6.

[47] As Deleuze puts it in *Desert Islands* concerning this world of impersonal individuations and pre-individual singularities, "that's what Nietzsche means when he says: 'neither God nor man,' it's anarchy triumphant... Nietzsche was trying to uncover something that was neither God nor Human, trying to give voice to these impersonal individuations and these pre-individual singularities... that's what he calls Dionysus, or also the overman." (ID, 190-2/137-139)

[48] NP, 1/1.

[49] ID, 188-9/136.

[50] NP, 203/177.

[51] NP, 90/79, "What does it want, this will without which the Earth itself remains meaningless? What is its quality, a quality which also becomes the quality of the Earth? Nietzsche replies: 'the weightless' [*La légère*]."

[52] NP, 3/3; Deleuze adds "the force which appropriates the thing, which exploits it, which takes possession of it or is expressed in it."

[53] Deleuze writes of transcendence as the 'poisoned gift' of Platonism, giving way to the aporias of the irreducibility of the immanence of the Earth in the *Timaeus*. Cf. Deleuze, "Remarques," 250. Perhaps it would be a question here of thinking transcendence as *pharmakon*.

[54] NP, 4/3.

[55] NP, 7/7.

[56] NP, 26/22, 45/40.

[57] NP, 60/53.

[58] NP, 64/57.

[59] NP, 70/62.

[60] In the English translations of both of Deleuze's monographs on Spinoza, 'puissance' (potentia) and 'pouvoir' (potestas) are rendered as 'power,' in keeping with Edwin Curley's translation of Spinoza's *Ethics*. As Martin Joughin, translator of *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza* cites this translator, while some French scholars have attempted to differentiate between 'puissance' and 'pouvoir' in Spinoza's work, "it is unclear that a systematic examination of Spinoza's usage would confirm even a prima facie distinction." (SPE n.a./408) If such a differentiation were to be accounted for, might it explain certain English-language readings of Deleuze as posing exclusively an ontology of force and power? Of course, the Will to Power has itself always been rendered as "la volonté de puissance" in French. Nonetheless, this difference between *potentia* and *potestas*, puissance and pouvoir will come to structure much at stake in biopolitics for Hardt and Negri, as well as Esposito.

[61] Deleuze does not elaborate on this characterization of the conatus as reactive in this text, but allow me to keep this insight in the background as I develop these readings. I will later in §5.4.1 show Esposito refer to the 'restricted economy' of the *conservatio vitae*. (EC, 18)

[62] SPE, 82/93.

[63] It is important to distinguish 'suffer' here from the suffering involving physical pain, mortality, and finitude. In the same translation, Martin Joughin renders 'pâtir' as 'suffer' with the following note: "a *passion* is something one suffers or undergoes *passively* (if not necessarily impassively, nor necessarily passionately). We suffer what is done to, or happens to, us; and our passions are opposed to our actions, what we 'do' to something else, as agent rather than as 'patient.' English does not have (as does French) a complex of cognate terms with which to render all the Latin cognates of *passio*, but the relations between these various aspects of 'passive' suffering should be kept in mind." (SPE n.a./421)

[64] SPE, 198-199/218-219.

[65] SPE, 203/223. I note here the difficult exclusion of a more sustained treatment of Leibniz's philosophy in these chapters; one could weave a thread through Husserl's own problematization of the monadology in the Fifth meditation, but also through Heidegger's 1928 lecture course on logic and transcendence in our previous chapter, which itself begins with a long discussion of Leibniz's logic. One could also follow these through to one of Deleuze's late pieces, *Le Pli*, which importantly engages questions of materiality of relevance to my analyses, and these also through Heidegger's own notion of the *Zweifalt*. One would also have to read Deleuze's opposing of Leibnizian equivocity to Spinozist Univocity, Leibniz' thought of the Baroque to Spinoza's pure philosophy of light.

What might a Derridean monadology resemble? I reserve this for another possible project. Cf. Gilles Deleuze, *Le Pli: Leibniz et le baroque* (Paris, Minuit, 1988); trans. Tom Conley as *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque* (London, Continuum, 1993).

[66] Deleuze refers to this as Spinoza's immoralism, "*a devaluation of all values, and of good and evil in particular (in favour of 'good' and 'bad')*." SPP, 3/22.

[67] SPE, 217/238, NP, 34/22. One could problematize this opposition between poison and remedy at length through Derrida's treatment of the *pharmakon* in *Dissemination*.

[68] SPE, 248/269, SPP, 35/23.

[69] SPE, 237-8/258-9.

[70] SPP, 37/25.

[71] SPP, 58/41.

[72] SPP, 132/100.

[73] NP, 9-10/8-9.

[74] NP, 204-5/178.

[75] Let's recall, as I mentioned in note 149 of chapter 3, that Levinas warns precisely against a reading of the *Tragen* in Celan's line as the carrying of a beast of burden. But the *Zusage,* acquiescence, must necessary risk this contamination if it is to affirm at all, which seems to be precisely Deleuze's point with respect to double affirmation.

[76] NP, 27/23. A possible source of complication here would engage Heidegger's critique of Nietzsche's reading of Heraclitus.

[77] NP, 55/48.

[78] N, 36/87, NP, 40/91.

[79] NP, 55-6/49-50. As he elaborates in *Difference and Repetition*, "Eternal return cannot mean the return of the Identical because it presupposes a world (that of the will to power) in which all previous identities have been abolished and dissolved. Returning is being, but only the being of becoming. The eternal return does not bring back 'the same,' but returning constitutes the only Same of that which becomes. Returning is the becoming-identical of becoming itself. Returning is thus the only identity, but identity as a secondary power; the identity of difference, the identical which belongs to the different, or turns around the different. Such an identity, produced by difference, is determined as repetition." (DR 59/41)

[80] DR, 52/35. The question of univocity has a long tradition in medieval philosophy; Spinoza develops the concept out of a critique of the notions of analogy and equivocity between God, the creator and his creatures. For Spinoza, God's expressions are univocal, "constituting the very nature of God as *natura naturans*, and involved in the nature of things or *natura naturanta* which, in a certain way, re-expresses them in its turn." (SPE 41/49) Both naturing and natured nature stand in a relationship of mutual immanence and thus posit a fundamental equality among all beings. Cf. also SPP, 115/92.

[81] SPE, 44/53.

[82] "A cause is immanent... when its effect is 'immanate' in the cause... its effect is in it – in it, of course, as in something else, but still being and remaining in it." (SPE 156/172)

[83] SPE, 157/173-4.

[84] Deleuze defines this (non)being as the being of the problematic, the being of problems and questions. This will be very important to my discussion of individuation in §4.2.3.

[85] SPP, 162/123.

[86] SPP, 163/124.

[87] SPP, 162/123, 169/128.

[88] Cf. PDS, 277/263.

[89] DF, 360/385.

[90] SPE, 257/278.

[91] SPE, 257n15/393n15.

[92] Deleuze summarizes the question thusly: "is there an Animal in itself or an Idea of the universal animal – or do the sub-kingdoms introduce impassable gulfs between the types of animals?" (DR 278/215)

[93] "Cuvier thus takes analogy to the scientific stage, making it an analogy of proportionality. The unity of the plane, according to him, can only be a unity of analogy, therefore a transcendent unity that cannot be realized without fragmenting into distinct branches, according to irreducible, uncrossable, heterogeneous compositions." (MPl 311/254)

[94] "Pure plane of immanence, univocity, composition, upon which everything is given, upon which unformed elements and materials dance... a fixed plane of life upon which everything stirs, slows down, or accelerates. A

single abstract Animal for all the assemblages that effectuate it. A unique plane of consistency or composition for the cephalopod and the vertebrate... *Plication*. It is no longer a question of organs and function, and of a transcendent Plane that can preside over their organization only by means of analogical relations and types of divergent development. It is a question not of organization but of composition; not of development or differentiation but of movement and rest, speed and slowness. It is a question of elements and particles, which do or do not arrive fast enough to effect a passage, a becoming or jump on the same plane of immanence." (MPl 312/255*t*)

[95] MPl, 53/48. That Derrida places the Body without Organs right alongside the concept of immanence as the last two things on which he would have questioned Deleuze is important to bear in mind here.

[96] MPl. 199/161. "*The body is never an organism. Organisms are the enemies of the body.*" (MP 196/158*t*)

[97] MPl, 197/159.

[98] But to cease to be an organism does not mean to kill oneself, as they explain, but rather "inventing self-destructions that have nothing to do with the death drive... you have to keep enough of the organism for it to reform each dawn." (MPl 198/160)

[99] One can frame this, as the authors imply, as a discussion between total translatability and total untranslatability. The irreducibility of these fixed forms, for Cuvier, "do not admit of translation or transformation. But the problem poses itself wholly otherwise as soon as it is recognized that a code is inseparable from a process of decoding that is inherent to it." (MPl 69/53*t*) This is relevant to my discussions of translation, at the material-physical, biological and ecological level, and at the epistemological-ontological-ethical level, to recall Karen Barad's term, and my discussions of translation as material-semiotic. Further, the authors write that, recalling Uexküll here, in opposition to the animal *Umwelt*, the distribution of affects, resistances and formless materialities on the plane of immanence, the classical scientific *Welt* "is the translation of all the flows, particles, codes, and territorialities of the other strata into a sufficiently deterritorialized system of signs, in other words, into an overcoding specific to language." (MPl 81/62) Indeed, they argue, the theory of biological mutations precisely illustrates how every process of coding operates within a supplement of decoding, even at the viroid level, which, as the authors cite Francois Jacob's *The Logic of Life*, are precisely not the translation from one fixed code to another, "but a singular phenomenon we call surplus value of code, or side-communication." (MPl 70/53) The first part of Derrida's *Life Death* seminar precisely deals with the question of viral translation, fascinated as Derrida is by the definition of a virus as neither living nor dead (see also AS 61-3, PV 21) and famously recalling, in another essay series of essays involving both Blanchot and double affirmation: "a text lives only if it lives on [*sur-vit*], and it lives on only if it is *at once* translatable and untranslatable (always 'at once...and...': *hama*, at the 'same' time)." (P 148/128) To think translation as necessarily involving logics of supplementarities and 'plus-values' already bring us on the path to thinking general ecology in and as translation. Due to reasons of economy, I cannot go into the fascinating work of Gilbert Simondon and its importance for Deleuze's philosophy; his critique of the 'hylomorphic' schematic of what the authors call "royal science" and its socio-political implications (one might again say its epistemological-ontological-ethical difficulties) and his theory of individuation. As cited in *A Thousand Plateaus*, "form corresponds to what the man in command has thought to himself, and must express in a positive manner when he gives his orders: form is thus of the order of the expressible," to which Simondon opposes "a dynamic schema, that of matter endowed with singularity-forces, or the energetic conditions at the basis of a system. The result is an entirely different conception of the relations between science and technology." (MPl 457n28/555n33) see also Simondon's recently published complete dissertation: *L'Individuation à la lumières des notions de formes et d'information* (Grenoble, Millon, 2013). A comparative study of Derrida and Simondon would be a fascinating area for future research. The two were aware of each other's work, and corresponded on Derrida's GREPH.

[100] F, 51/43.

[101] Power for Foucault, "is not essentially repressive (since it 'incites, induces, produces')... it passes through the hands of the mastered no less than through the hands of the masters (since it passes through every related force). A profound Nietzscheanism." (F 78/71)

[102] F, 95/89.

[103] DF, 238/255.

[104] DF, 238/255, PP, 133/97.

[105] The double, Deleuze writes, "is never a projection of the interior; on the contrary, it is an interiorization of the outside. It is never a doubling of the One, but a redoubling of the Other. It is not a reproduction of the Same, but a repetition of the Different. It is not the emanation of an 'I', but something that places in immanence an always other or a Non-self. It is never the other who is a double in the doubling process, it is a self that lives me as the double of the other: I do not encounter myself on the outside, I find the other in me." (F 105/98)

[106] PP, 150/84.

[107] Cf. also F, 98/92.
[108] F, 98/92-3.
[109] Deleuze cites Foucault here from *The Birth of the Clinic*. "Bichat relativized the concept of death, brining it down from that absolute in which it appeared as an indivisible, decisive, irrecoverable event: he volatilized it, distributed it throughout life in the form of separate, partial, progressive deaths, deaths that are so slow in occurring that they extend even beyond death itself... vitalism appears against the background of this mortalism." (NC 146/144-5) I'll return to Foucault's readings of Bichat and Blanchot in §5.2.2 and §5.2.3.
[110] DR, 4/xxi.
[111] LS, 120/98-9. As Deleuze adds, "The foundation can never resemble what it founds. It does not suffice to say of the foundation that it is another hi/story [*histoire*] – it is also another geography, without being another world." This relation between the ground and the without-ground, (*le fond* and *le sans-fond*) might be entered, en-terred into a thought of the *terre sans terre* I imagined in chapter 2. See also my closing note to this chapter, note 207.
[112] QP, 50/46-7.
[113] Or the Flesh, Deleuze and Guattari add; possibly referring to Levinas and Merleau-Ponty here.
[114] QP, 51/47.
[115] DR, 317/246.
[116] DR, 317/246, ID, 122/87.
[117] Although this notion is developed through Bergson rather than Levinas and Blanchot. I'll again acknowledge in my project the unfortunate lack of attention to Bergson in developing Deleuze's philosophy of life and materiality. Another point of comparison on the questions of transcendence and immanence might engage a comparative study of Bergson and Levinas's understanding of 'the past that has never been present.'
[118] DR, 97/71.
[119] DR, 107/78.
[120] DR, 107/78.
[121] But interestingly, Deleuze speaks here of a transcendence of questions and problems with respect to their responses and solutions; adding later that "the problem is at once both transcendent and immanent in relation to its solutions." (DR 212/163) I remain unsure of how to interpret this in Deleuze's logic.
[122] DR, 109/80. The second synthesis allows Deleuze to account for several paradoxes in the passage of time that would certainly merit further examination, and perhaps also a few complications, given its confusing elaboration as alternatively active and passive.
[123] "At once that which *cannot* be thought and that which *must* be thought and can be thought only from the point of view of the transcendent exercise... Imperatives in the form of questions thus signify our greatest powerlessness." (DR 257/199*e*)
[124] DR, 258/200.
[125] "Pure Saying [*pur dire*] and pure event... neither active nor passive, univocal being is neutral. It is itself *extra-being*, that is to say this minimum of being common to the real, the possible, and the impossible... univocal being is the pure form of *Aiôn*." (LS 211/180)
[126] DR, 352/277, 17/18.
[127] DR, 149/113, 333/259.
[128] "We will say that *THE* plane of immanence is, at the same time, that which must be thought and that which cannot be thought. It is the nonthought within thought... It is the most intimate within thought and yet the absolute outside." (QP 52/59)
[129] This isn't to say something like "of course, Deleuze and Bataille couldn't *possibly* mean what they say when they use the word 'immanence.'" Nor is it to assimilate their discourses to what I find worthwhile in Derrida and Blanchot. But Deleuze's notion of immanence is so otherwise than the immanence of the transcendental and the empirical, form and norm, ethical and ontological as would be traditionally understood that I can't help but feel something else, something 'secret' as Derrida puts it is going on there, as immanence slides into nonsense in the framework of general ecology. "If each notion must be reinscribed within the law of its on sliding and must be related to the sovereign operation, one must not make of these requirements the subordinate moment of a structure. The reading of Bataille must pass through these two dangerous straits. It must not isolate notions as if they were their own context, as if one could immediately understand the content of words like 'experience,' 'interior,' 'mystic,' 'work,' 'material,' 'sovereign,' etc." (ED 401/345)
[130] OC6, 175/n 150.
[131] Blanchot's *The Writing of Disaster* is, as Derrida puts it in his eulogy to Blanchot, "haunted by the unnameable incineration that was the holocaust, the event of which we know, like another name of the absolute disaster,

immediately became the center of the most insistent gravity of his work. As it will indirectly be everywhere else, the holocaust is recalled at the opening of the book. Which designates the 'the burn of the holocaust, the annihilation of noon' and 'immobile forgetfulness (memory of the immemorable)'" that constitutes the disaster. Even if this disaster, he says again, 'we know [it] by other names' [BED 15/6]." (CU 328/n.a., *t*) Of course, Blanchot also lists the disaster as more or less synonymous with the Outside, the Neutral and Return, and it's this terrifying logic of contamination I want to flesh out here, while realizing this can pass for the most brutish insensitivity, and I'm not sure I even have the courage to do so here.

[132] OC5, 472.

[133] OC5, 479.

[134] OC5, 462.

[135] OC5, 206/u 86.

[136] OC5, 464, 482.

[137] OC6, 107/n 85. "Seen from the standpoint of action, Nietzsche's work amounts to failure [*un avortement*]." (OC6 22/n xxviii)

[138] OC5, 319/g 77.

[139] "L'*Unwissenheit um die Zukunft*." (OC5 260/g 25)

[140] OC5, 178/e 154.

[141] OC5, 449-50.

[142] A double impossibility, in fact; "the impossible in the common representation of time is met only at the extremes of antecedent and future eternity. In the eternal return, the instant itself is one impossible movement projected towards these two extremes." (OC6 312/u 24)

[143] OC6, 313/u 25.

[144] OC5, 466.

[145] BPF, 284/293.

[146] BEI, 232/155.

[147] In *The Politics of Friendship*, Derrida writes that Levinas would be the third reliable friend, joining the friendships of Bataille and Blanchot from the very beginning. (PA 326/293) See also note 206 below.

[148] BEL, 160/154.

[149] "*That everyone, be he separated from or united with others, be he speaking or silent, receives, bears, and sustains through an intimate accord anterior to any decision, an accord such that any attempt to repudiate it, promoted or willed always by the very will of discourse, confirms it*." (BEI xxiv-xxv/xxii)

[150] BEI, 11/10.

[151] As I have shown, Heidegger gathers Nietzsche's thought into metaphysics – the unity view of beings as such and as whole – which cannot think beings in their *difference* from Being, thus ignores the question of Being and cannot let beings be. For Blanchot, however, the question of Being and the dialectical question of the whole come down to one another. The question of Being Heidegger wishes to show in its difference from the totality of beings – dialectically and metaphysically thought as a whole – becomes 'immobilized' in several points for Blanchot. Even when Heidegger posits a 'hearing' as anterior to the question in *The Principle of Reason*, this hearing is itself understood in terms of vision and sight, reiterating a preference running through all metaphysics, ontology and phenomenology within which everything that is can be thought in terms of light or its absence. Most glaring for Blanchot is that this play between hearing and seeing would always refer itself to the One; "the question of being that dies away as a question is a question that dies away in hearing the One. The One, the Same, remain the first and the last words." (BEI 34n1/440n3) To think beyond the ontological and dialectical gathering of being in terms of light, unity and wholeness, Blanchot writes, one must escape this reference to the One towards the other question, the question of the Other. In the dialectical and ontological thoughts of mastery, the question always refers to the Same and to the whole. Blanchot, in its stead, imagines a 'panic question,' a '*question profonde*' within which "the whole is with regard to the other – not content with being everything, but designating the other than the whole (what is absolutely other and has no place in the whole), thus affirming the Wholly Other where there is no longer any return to the same." (BEI 25/19*t*) This other question, a questioning anterior and foreign to the question, engages an order of invisibility irreducible to the opposition of the visible and the visible. In its passivity, neutrality and powerlessness, it opens onto a dimension that "questions everything by way of what would be outside of everything, questioning the 'world' by way of a 'non-world' where the question no longer has a question's value, dignity, or power." (BEI 25/19) Indeed, Blanchot writes, we question more than we can question; something within this question-affirmation necessarily exceeds the power to question, "the question as the impossibility of questioning. In the profound question, impossibility questions." (BEI 27/20)

[152] BEI, 224/149.
[153] "A being without being in the becoming without end of a death impossible to die... an affirmation that affirms more than can be affirmed. This more itself is the experience: affirming only by an excess of affirmation and, in this surplus, affirming without anything being affirmed, finally affirming nothing." (BEI 310/209)
[154] BEI, 53-4/38. Philosophy, Blanchot explains, will have always sought to mark either a space of discontinuity, interruption or rupture (as in Heraclitus, Nietzsche, or Bataille) or the plenitude and density of a field gathering all differences in their tensions, a thought of continuity, finding its fulfillment in the dialectical inclusion of the discontinuous within the continuous. The continuous, to recall Derrida's discussion in *La vie la mort*, risks coming down to a simple thought of a development from one opposition to an other, *La vie est la mort*. Discontinuity, for its part, risks coming down to a simple juxtaposition, *La vie et la mort*. But in the unheard difference between the continuity and juxtaposition of life death, almost inaudibly, imperceptibly whispers a wholly other relation. On the one hand, continuity-juxtaposition, and on the other, something wholly otherwise, what Blanchot calls a double contradiction; the necessity to think the other, to think life death I'd say, "*once as the distortion of a field that is nevertheless continuous, as the dislocation and the rupture of discontinuity* [restricted ecology] – *and then as the infinite of a relation that is without terms and as the infinite termination of a term without relation.*" (BEI 105/74) The discontinuity between the two moments is not the simple opposition of their continuity. Discontinuity for Blanchot does not arrest becoming; Nietzsche's great thought was to recognize that "becoming is not the fluidity of an infinite (Bergsonian) *durée*, nor the mobility of an interminable movement. The first knowledge is a knowledge of the treating apart – the breaking up – of Dionysus." (BEI 235/157)
[155] BEI, 417/281.
[156] Cf. Emmanuel Levinas, *Autrement qu'être ou au-delà de l'essence* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1978), 15; trans. Alphonso Lingis as *Otherwise than Being or Beyond Essence* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1991), 4-5.
[157] BED, 141/89-90,168-9/109-10, 162/104.
[158] BED, 94/57.
[159] BEI, 242/162, 410/275.
[160] ED, 45/32.
[161] BEI, 240-1/160-1.
[162] See my discussions in §1.1.2 and §1.2.2 on the relations between transgression and transcendence.
[163] L8, 2.
[164] L10, 2. In this session, Derrida indicates a desire to engage this question of authenticity in relation to Heidegger's thought on being-towards-death and authentic temporalization, but cannot for lack of time. (L10, 2) He would take these questions up much later in *Aporias*.
[165] A, 86-7/45-6.
[166] L10, 1.
[167] "Survivance is the name of the mother. This survival is my life which she overflows, and the name of my death, of my dead life, there is the name of my father." (OA 29/16*t*) As he puts it in the seminar, "Ich kenne beides ich bin beides, I know both, the two, one should rather say, I am the two and the two here, it's life death (beides)... the two as death life, the dead [*le mort*] the living [*la vivante*]." (L2, 11*t*)
[168] "One foot *beyond* life... mit einem Fusse jenseits des Lebens," (L2, 13*t*)
[169] "notre monde tout entier est la *cendre* d'innombrables êtres *vivants*, et si peu de chose soit le vivant pas rapport à la totalité, il reste que une fois déjà *tout* (*alles*) a été converti en vie (is alles schon einmal in Leben umgesetzt) et continuera de l'être ainsi." (L9, 1*t*)
[170] Cf. Derrida, "Interpreting Signatures," 69-70.
[171] Cf. Derrida, "Interpreting Signatures," 71.
[172] The thought of totality that regulates the relation between species and genera similarly finds itself 'dislocated' here; in opposing life to death as "the species of the opposite genera or the genera of a larger set, the part of its opposition, [...] opposition is no longer at play, nor juxtaposition, but a strange inclusion without possible totalisation." (L9, 3*t*) Derrida examines Heidegger's critique of the Eternal Return in more detail in these lectures. It should be noted, however, that the typescript of *Life Death* on these points displays some serious anxiety on several levels; the pages are riddled with things crossed out, question marks, arrows and so on. What I've covered so far in the eighth and ninth sessions was republished as "Interpreting Signatures." The following reading of the ninth session in this note should be approached with this in mind. As I showed, despite Nietzsche's intentions, the Eternal Return for Heidegger articulates a humanization and anthropologization of beings as a whole. Nietzsche, against both the vitalism and Darwinism of his time thinks this totality of beings as life, structurally securing the conditions for its preservation/enhancement according to the principle of the Will to Power. This principle of life, Derrida

explains, "consists in placing oneself at the principle, that is to say the commencement-commandment, the *archè* that means at once commencement and commandment (as *principum*)"; precisely as what I determined as the reciprocal immanence of the form and norm of life is thought from the Will to Power as the basis for the revaluation of all values. (L10, 4*t*) This value of commandment is for Heidegger related to a poeticizing: "if Nietzsche in fact returns everything to life, to the 'biological,' he so little thinks biologically, biologistically, he so little thinks life on the basis of biological (animal or vegetative life) that he determines the essence of the living being in the direction (*Richtung*) of the capacity-to-poetify (*Befels – une Dichtungschaften*)... It is from and in view of the human (perspective, horizon, commandment, *Dichtung*, representation of the being) that Nietzsche thinks the living being." (L10, 4*t*) Nietzsche's culmination of the delimitation of being as *phusis* consists in interpreting beings as a whole as life, human life, the essence of life being the Will to Power. Despite his own desire to see the Eternal Return as a thought of dehumanization, Nietzsche's philosophy remains in metaphysics in correlating the question of the totality of beings with the question 'what is man?' I mentioned above, however, that for Derrida a dehiscence operates in Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche every time the question of the proper is raised. For Heidegger, the Eternal Return must be understood as operating according to a vulgar concept of time. In thinking beings as a whole as life, closed off to the question of Being, an authentic relation to death and letting beings be, it remains closed to the understanding of time as the transcendental horizon of the question. As Derrida writes, Nietzsche's concept of *chaos* will determine whether, for Heidegger, he thinks time metaphysically, or as something else. In fact, he suggests, the entire problematic of Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche may hinge on this point. It is on the question of the *instant* in the Eternal Return that Derrida locates the site of Heidegger's *fort-da* with Nietzsche, placing him on the one hand beyond metaphysics and on the other within it. (Derrida specifies, however, that he does not intend to argue that the Eternal Return is in no way traditional, "I believe it also has a profound relationship to the tradition, that it is a thought of the tradition, but the question remains of the novelty of the tradition and of the traditional relationship to the tradition (same thing for Heidegger)." (L9, 6*t*) Heidegger reads Nietzsche's adaptation of Heraclitus' *Aiôn* in terms of totality and of the authority of the present in its eternity and infinity. We will recall that for Heidegger, which Derrida cites again here, "viewed as a whole, Nietzsche's meditations on time and space are quite meagre." (GA *6.1*, 310/*2* 90). If the question of infinity is so central to the thought of Return, how can Heidegger on the one hand thus attempt to save Nietzsche's thought as the last great metaphysics all the while dismissing everything Nietzsche says about time? When Heidegger summarizes Nietzsche's thought as the collective character of the world as chaos, he interprets chaos as the totality of beings. For Derrida, however, this rests on an implicit interpretive gesture in Heidegger; when Nietzsche uses the word Being, Heidegger "in such a crude manner it's a little laughable" substitutes 'the totality of beings,' which he then uses to define chaos. (L9, 14*t*) However, Derrida writes, this does not take into account anything that Nietzsche says about chaos as a chain, as a yawning gap, everything that should prevent chaos from becoming a thought of totalization.

[173] L10, 13.

[174] Derrida will engage Heidegger's *Time and Being* at length in the unpublished sections of his *Donner le temps* seminar, but also sporadically throughout *La Chose*.

[175] NII, 35.

[176] DE 93/74.

[177] DE, 21-2/10, 70n2/119n3.

[178] NII, 35.

[179] ADS, 173/126.

[180] Quasi-transcendental, he writes, because the 'yes' is irreducible to a "discourse on the conditions of an object – theoretical, practical, aesthetic – for a subject), (P2 247/239) quasi-ontological because irreducible to a "discourse on the being of a presence." (P2 247/239)

[181] UG, 132/103.

[182] P2, 245-7/238-9.

[183] P2 245/238. Derrida fascinatingly recalls Ponge's *Fable* here, "par le mot par commence ce texte," which is also at the heart of his discussions of biological auto-hetero-affection, as well as the circulation of 'life' as a model in science, translation, etc. in the sixth session of *La Vie la mort*.

[184] HC, 84-5/94-5.

[185] P 25/14. The same, he says, holds for what I elaborated above as arche-writing, which can always necessarily be contaminated by writing in the narrow sense.

[186] P, 25/15.

[187] UG, 70/265.

[188] UG, 141/308.

[189] "It is the weak, not the strong, that defies dialectics. Right is dialectical, justice is not-dialectical, justice is weak." (TS 33)
[190] "Selection in favour of the stronger, better-constituted, and the progress of the species. Precisely the opposite is palpable: the elimination of the lucky strokes, the uselessness of the more highly developed types, the inevitable domination of the average, even the *sub-average* types." (Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, §364, cited in L3, 12).
[191] See also Derrida's discussion in *H.C. for Life* relating his reading of Francois Jacob to "these problems of identity and sight, of double life [*double vie*] and double vision [*double vue*]" (HC, 54-5/58-9)
[192] ED, 45/32.
[193] PV, 69, 71.
[194] See particularly, in this respect, Derrida's footnote in NG 268-9n14/32-3n15, as well as his discussion in *Limited Inc*, /148-9. In *H.C. for Life*, he builds on Hélène Cixous's word '*puissance*' [might] as one beyond any will-to-live, power-to-live, possibility or potentiality, testifying rather to impossibility, unpower, vulnerability and death. (Cf. HC 21/17, 24/20, 94/107) One could read such a *puiss-ance* in '*volonté de puissance'* precisely in the middle voice, the neutral beyond metaphysical activity and passivity in *survivance, revenance, différance*, etc.
[195] See NII, 35, and FL, 21/235; "I have always been uncomfortable with the word *force* even if I have often judged it indispensible." §5.1 will take this up at length.
[196] NG, 268-9n. 14/32-3 n. 15.
[197] "Beyond all conceptual oppositions, *Bemächtigung* indeed situates one of the exchangers between the drive to dominate as the drive of the drive, and the 'Will to Power.'" (CP 432/403)
[198] MP, 18-9/17.
[199] L3, 7.
[200] DB, 117/87.
[201] P, 151-3/132-4.
[202] Cf. DQ, 17/4-5.
[203] Even if Derrida goes on to say that "We must pass by here, we too, we must pass over in silence, as low as possible to the earth, the return of the animal: not the figure of the old mole ('Well said, old Mole')" (SM 154/117) I'm tempted to link this thought in relation to what Deleuze and Guattari call "the mole of the transcendent within immanence itself." (QP 50/46) This note is dedicated to Jennifer Schade.
[204] Cf. BS2, 369-70/267-8.
[205] Cf. PA 323/290-1 for an approximate typology.
[206] Cf. Derrida's interview in DN, 14, and also *Parages* on this. "'But we are led through the teaching of Levinas before a radical experience. *Autrui* is entirely Other; the other is what exceeds me absolutely. The relation with the other that is *autrui* is a transcendent relation, which means that there is an infinite, and, in a sense, an impassable distance [*dis-tance*] between myself and the other, who belongs to the other shore [*rive*], who has no country [*patrie*] in common with me, and who cannot in any way assume equal rank in a same concept or a same whole.' (BEI 74/52)... But can one, ought one to, *must one* land on [faut-il *aborder*] this other shore? Wouldn't it immediately cease to be the other? Would the event still come about? Wouldn't it be hit with an interdiction (*not! ne pas!*) on its very arrival, according to the double no/pace of the law, its double bond [*lien*], its circlelessly circular double knot that is on first approach crossed? "The circle of the law is this: there must be a crossing in order for there to be a limit, but only the limit, inasmuch as uncrossable, summons to cross, affirms the desire (the false step, the *faux pas*) that has already, through an unforeseeable moment, crossed the line.' Just like death ('always on the horizon of the law'...) 'that prevents us from dying' and from which is withdrawn 'in advance from the benefit of an *event*.'" (P 66-7/54-5)
[207] This 'without ground' is taken up a little earlier, in a sense that, if I've been reading life death and survivance as saying more or less the same thing, truly testifies to the logic of the double cited in epigraph (doubly cited in epigraph, Blanchot citing Nietzsche in epigraph). "No, the survivance I am speaking of is something other than life death, but *a groundless ground* from which are detached, identified and opposed what we think we can identify under the name of death or dying (*Tod*, *Sterben*), like death properly s-called as opposed to some life properly so-called. *It* [Ça] begins with survival." (BS2 194/131*e*) One would have to engage this notion of 'ground without ground' with everything Deleuze says about foundation, *fondement,* and ungrounding in the syntheses of time in *Difference and Repetition* and *The Logic of Sense*.

Notes to chapter five: Biopolitics and Double Affirmation v5.0: Step/nots beyond an Ecology of the Commons
[1] The first formulation of this chapter was for a comprehensive exam in the writing of this dissertation in September 2013, the second given at the *Derrida Today* conference at Fordham University in New York City, June 2014, and

the third at a meeting of the Society for the Study of Biopolitical Futures at the *Society for Literature, Science, and the Arts* for its year's theme "After Biopolitics," at Rice University in Houston, Texas in November 2015. The fourth staked its argument a little differently over some 75 pages, and appears in a much-refined form here.

[2] Lawlor, *The Implications of Immanence*, 106.

[3] Mick Smith, *Against Ecological Sovereignty: Ethics, Biopolitics, and Saving the Natural World* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2011), xv-xvi.

[4] Ibid., 106.

[5] Cf. FL, 42/246-7, AS, 122/87, *passim*.

[6] Smith, *Against Ecological Sovereignty*, 45.

[7] The affirmative turn to life, which I think underlies much affirmative biopolitics, can be summarized in Elizabeth Grosz's reading of Darwin; "this is perhaps the only ethics internal to life itself: to maximize action, to enable the proliferation of actions, movements," also drawing from Nietzsche in opposing "the other-directedness of a reactive herd morality and the self-affirmation of an active or noble morality unconcerned with the other and its constraints, directed only to its own powers and to the fullest affirmation of its own forces." Elizabeth Grosz, *Becoming Undone* (Durham, Duke University Press, 2011), 22, 61. One finds a similar argument in the work of Rosi Braidotti, who argues that "the emphasis on life itself can engender affirmative politics," calling forth a "vitality, unconcerned by the clear-cut distinctions between living and dying, compos[ing] the notion of '*zoe*' as a non-human yet affirmative life-force." For Braidotti, "death is overrated," the fixation on mortality and finitude at work in other biopolitical thought "produces a gloomy and pessimistic vision not only of power, but also of the technological developments that propel the regimes of bio-power." Braidotti hopes to bring together Spinoza, Deleuze and Hardt and Negri into a "politics of life itself as a relentlessly generative force." Rosi Braidotti, "Biopower and Necropolitics," published as "Biomacht und nekro-Politik. Uberlegungen zu einer Ethik der Nachhaltigkeit" *Singerin, Hefte fur Gegenwartskunst* 8,2 (2007), 3, 6. A similar argument appears in Jane Bennett's conclusion to *Vibrant Matter*, arguing for the necessity of going beyond the ecological-ethical maxim 'tread lightly on the earth,' in favour of "grander, more dramatic and violent expenditures of human energy." Jane Bennett, *Vibrant Matter* (Durham, Duke University Press, 2010), 122.

[8] Many have proposed similar arguments; Paul Harrison, for example, suggests the necessity of a 'critique of immanentism,' which would "rais[e] questions over the compatibility or otherwise of ethics with an ontology of power." Paul Harrison, "'*How Shall I Say it?'* Relating the Nonrelational," *Environment and Planning A* 39 (2007), 592. Steve Hinchliffe is also suspicious of the attempt to "replace an ontology of division with one of force – a Nietzschean world where everything is in principle related to everything else." Such an ontology of force dangerously calls forth a hybrid nature, "a seamless world in which it becomes almost impossible to envisage or enact anything at all." *Geographies of Nature: Societies, Environments, Ecologies* (Los Angeles, Sage Publications, 2007), 55. A non-appropriative relation to the environment, Michael Marder argues, must avoid "an undifferentiated flux of becoming, a vortex of immanence sweeping everything into its homogeneous mix." *Plant Thinking: A Philosophy of Vegetal Life* (New York, Columbia University Press, 2013), 166.

[9] On 'biopolitical sovereignty,' see Amy Swiffen, *Law, Ethics and the Biopolitical* (New York, Routledge, 2011).

[10] Cf. AEL 93/49 and passim. Recall my discussion of the 'underside' [*envers*] of concepts in §1.3.2. Cf. FF, 11. I draw the term 'impolitical' from Roberto Esposito's *Categories of the Impolitical*, and its use may seem a little jarring to readers of Derrida. In a late interview on Levinas, Derrida specifically cautions against the recuperation and de-politicization of Levinas's work by way of a 'right-thinking' and self-congratulatory discourse of the other. Cf. AL, 5.

[11] While this biopolitics of double affirmation is undoubtedly Derridean and owes a debt to Bataille and Blanchot, I'd completely refuse determining affirmative biopolitics as Deleuzian. Many of its proponents, however, seem to draw from his work, for example from *Negotiations*, when Deleuze writes of Foucault's 'vitalism' as engaging a 'subjectivation,' which "amounts essentially to inventing new possibilities of life, as Nietzsche would say, to establishing what one may truly call styles of life: here it's a vitalism rooted in aesthetics." (PP 125/91) But I'd argue these readings offer a very selective interpretation of Deleuze's work that seems to ignore everything he develops concerning the Outside, death, passivity and powerlessness, not to mention his own readings of Foucault and Blanchot I examined in §4.2.2 and §4.2.3. If I'd began by asking whether immanence was really the best way to think powerlessness, the term itself in Deleuze's work was revealed as intimately bound to a notion of double affirmation, one much more complex than the affirmation of the Spinozist *conatus*, essentially bound to a notion of *selection*.

[12] DF, 238/255.

[13] A third alternative is hinted at in the work of Donna Haraway, who expresses a dissatisfaction with the Derridean notion of the non-power at the heart of power, which she reads as "only part of the needed reformulation. There is an annameable being/becoming with in copresence... which is about suffering *and* expressive, relational vitality, in all the vulnerable mortality of both. I am (inadequately) calling that expressive, mortal, world-making vitality 'play' or 'work,' not to designate a fixable capability in relation to which beings can be ranked, but to affirm a kind of 'non-power at the heart of power' other than suffering. Maybe a usable word for this is *joy*. [Mortality] does not reside only in suffering, in my view... Capability (play) and incapability (suffering) are *both* all about mortality and finitude." Donna J. Haraway, *When Species Meet* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 310-1, n. 27. I will return to Haraway's work in my next chapter. More recently, her conversation with Cary Wolfe at the end of *Manifestly Haraway* outlines important points in thinking together ecological thought, biopolitics and the notion of doubling. "CW: The question does not become just 'killable but not murderable,' and it does not become just 'Thou shalt not kill,' but it becomes, as you put it, 'Thou shalt not make killable.' It's on that specific terrain that I think there is an opening that has yet to be fully worked through, a crossing between biopolitical thought and ecological thought, because part of what animates your work in light of that commitment is to say, 'look, if the issue is "Thou shalt not make killable," then it's not about escaping killing or escaping death. It's about what posture or what stance does one take toward life.' DH: Toward *this* killing... CW: Toward *this* killing or this life in its specificity... DH: Toward *this* living and dying, *this* nurturing and killing...CW:... in its specificity... DH:... in its more-than-doubleness...." Donna J. Haraway, *Manifestly Haraway* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2016), 233.
[14] Smith, *Against Ecological Sovereignty*, 150.
[15] Wolfe, *Before the Law*, 59
[16] Smith, *Against Ecological Sovereignty*, 45.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Wolfe, *Before the Law*, 60.
[20] Cf. Ibid., 82.
[21] Smith, *Against Ecological Sovereignty*, 108.
[22] Roberto Esposito, "Interview," *Diacritics* 36,2 (2006), 51-2.
[23] Cf. ED, 380n.1/437n.15. I'll return to this text in §5.2.3.
[24] See my reading of Freud and Jacob in §1.1.1.
[25] An earlier version of this text was titled "Beyond the Power Principle," and was recently translated by Elizabeth Rottenberg and published in *The Undecidable Unconscious: A Journal of Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis* 2 (2015): 7-17.
[26] Cf. PP, 148/109.
[27] Derrida has no interest in outlining a specifically modern genesis to biopower either. As he writes in *The Ear of the Other*, "no, no... As for me, I'm no fan of modernity. I have no simple belief in the irreducible specificity of 'modernity.' I even wonder if I have ever used that word. In any case, I am very mistrustful whenever people identify historical breaks or when they say, 'This begins there.' I have never done that, and I believe I have even set down here and there reservations with regard to this type of periodization and distribution." (OA 115/84)
[28] PM2, 24, 113.
[29] "*Just as well* or just as badly than the economic and social machines (the market, the labour market, pauperization, international debt, etc.) which are so many techno-scientifico-capitalistic mechanisms having the property of distributing in a terribly inegalitarian way the right to life, longevity and which not only condemn to die prematurely an incalculable number of living beings, human and nonhuman." (PM2 268*t*) Cf. also PC, 467.
[30] P1, 60/45. Derrida recalls here the line of Ponge's fable I mentioned in chapter 4, note 183 in defining the mechanisms of life's doubling and exteriorization in its relations to death and its environment; "*Par le mot par commence ce texte*." (P1 18/7) Derrida is fascinated with the logic of iterability at play in this small sentence, which both cites and performs itself, as tantamount to what he calls invention; "the concept of invention distributes its two essential values between these two poles: the constative – discovering or unveiling, pointing out or saying what is – and the performative – producing, instituting, transforming." (P1 23/12) In oscillating between describing and performing, the descriptive and the normative, indeed the ontological and the ethical, *par le mot par* produces an event that overflows the traditional opposition between these terms. "An invention of the other that would come, through the economy of the same, indeed, while miming or repeating it ('*Par le mot* par ...') to offer a place for the other, to let the other come." (P1 60/45) This poem indeed appears in all of Derrida's mid-to-late seventies seminars, *La Vie la mort*, *La Chose*, *Théorie et pratique* and *Donner le temps*.
[31] P1, 61/46, PC, 467.

[32] And one could add along with it traditional dimensions of normativity and valuation, indeed the techno-capitalist logic intent on blurring the boundaries between the opposition of making and letting, all of which still presuppose too much of the classical definition of sovereign activity, power, and force.
[33] Cf. MH, 145.
[34] NII, 202. "If [these decisions] invoke *freedom* and *responsibility*, [they] must naturally take into account the scientific knowledge about the aforementioned norms," but the decision itself, with respect to the norm, must at a certain moment "escape scientificity, they must escape a techno-scientific programming." (NII 200)
[35] "Deconstruction, "is inventive or nothing at all... its *process* [démarche] invokes an affirmation, the latter being linked to the coming – the *venire* – in event, advent, invention... For a deconstructive operation, possibility is rather the danger, the danger of becoming an available set of rule-governed procedures, methods, available approaches. The interest of deconstruction... is a certain experience of the impossible: that is... of the other – the experience of the other as the invention of the impossible, in other words, as the only possible invention. (P1 35/23)
[36] P1, 53/39. As Derrida write in *Echographies of Television*, in a non-dialectical sense of course, "we are only ever opposed to those events that we think obstruct the future or bring death, to those events that put an end to the possibility of the event, to the affirmative opening for the coming of the other." (ET 19/11)
[37] "Letting the other come is not inertia ready for anything whatever... one gets ready for it, one makes the step destined to let the other come, *come in*." (P1 53/39)
[38] "Preserves something passive, even unconscious, as if the deciding one was free only by letting himself be affected by his own decision and as if it came to him from the other." (FL 58/255)
[39] FL, 60/256.
[40] 'Perhaps' – one must [*il faut*] always say *perhaps* for justice. There is an avenir for justice and there is no justice except to the degree that some event is possible which, as event, exceeds calculation, rules, programs, anticipations, and so forth. Justice, as the experience of the absolute alterity, is unpresentable, but it is the chance of the event and the condition of history. (FL 61/257)
[41] MS, 78/254. Indeed the word *force* itself is inadequate for Derrida, as I showed in §4.4.1.
[42] VS, 187/142.
[43] BS1, 438/330.
[44] VS, 121-2/92-3.
[45] VS, 127/96, 177/135.
[46] IF, 214/240.
[47] VS, 179/136.
[48] VS, 179-80/136-7
[49] IF, 219/246.
[50] VS, 187-8, 142-3.
[51] IF, 225-6/253
[52] VS, 180/137.
[53] IF, 228-9/256.
[54] VS, 190-1/144-5.
[55] MC, 139/139.
[56] MC, 245/252, 286/298.
[57] I'd add that much in Derrida's early work on Husserl attempts to weave these two strains together; recalling the importance of *The Transcendence of the Ego* both for Derrida and Deleuze in their development of the pre-subjective transcendental field. See my chapters 2-4 above.
[58] MC, 235/252.
[59] MC, 259/267.
[60] DE4, 768-73/470-4.
[61] DE4, 774-5/476.
[62] MC, 136/132, 144-6/144-146.
[63] Another point of contrast between Derrida and Foucault would problematize this allegedly modern category of autopsy and visibility as thoroughly one of sovereignty, commenting on Louis' autopsy of the elephant; "It is not original but it is not false, no doubt, to recall that the scene of knowledge, and especially of knowledge in the form of the objectivity of the ob-ject, of the knowledge that has what it knows or wants to know at its disposal in the form of an ob-ject disposed before it – [that this sence of autopsic/autoptic knowledge] supposes that one disposes, that one posese before oneself, and that one has taken power over the object of knowledge." (BS1 375/279) Knowledge is a question of "wanting-to-be-able [*vouloir-pouvoir*] and first of all as wanting-to-see [*vouloir voir*] and *wanting-*

to-have [*vouloir-avoir*].” (BS1 376/280) In the first volume of *The Death Penalty*, Derrida also expresses some hesitations before Foucault’s idea that the spectacular and theatrical, the *seeing-punish* [voir-punir] aspects of the death penalty begin to disappear at the beginning of the 19th Century. “I am not so sure of this, but perhaps there is here a technical, tele-technical, or even televisual complication of seeing, or even a virtualization of visual perception to which we will return.” (PM1 75/43)

[64] MC, 241-2/248-9, 252/259.

[65] NC, 174/122.

[66] NC, 9/xii.

[67] “The phenomena of partial or progressive death prejudge no future: they show a process fulfilling itself; after apoplexy, most of the animal functions are naturally suspended, and consequently death has already begun for them, whereas the organic functions continue their own life.” (NC 199/142)

[68] As I cited *The Birth of the Clinic* in epigraph, wondering if this small sentence gave its name to Derrida’s seminar.

[69] MC, 269/280.

[70] MC, 337-9/356-7.

[71] MC, 343/362.

[72] DE1, 520/148-9/ 523/151-2.

[73] VS, 185/141.

[74] “The adjustment of the accumulation of men to that of capital, the joining of the growth of human groups to the expansion of productive forces and the differential allocation of profit, were made possible in part by the exercise of bio-power in its many forms and modes of application. The investment of the living body, its valorization, and the distributive management of its forces were at the time indispensible.” (VS 186/141)

[75] MC, 268/279.

[76] MC, 269/279.

[77] MC, 269-71/280-2. In this radical finitude of the human, two possibilities for history open up: Ricardo’s pessimism and Marx’s revolutionary promise. In Ricardo’s case, history fulfills man’s originary finitude in a total superposition of finitude and production; “any additional agricultural labour would be useless; any excess population would perish. Life and death will fit exactly one against the other, surface to surface, both immobilized and as it were reinforced by their reciprocal antagonism.” (MC 272/283) On Foucault’s reading of Marx, however, history attains “a point of reversal at which it becomes fixed only insofar as it suppresses what it had always and continuously been beforehand.” (MC 272/283)... “History, by dispossessing man of his labour, causes the positive form of his finitude to spring into relief – his material truth is finally liberated.” (MC 273/284) But both Ricardo’s pessimism and Marx’s revolutionary promise are simply, it seems for Foucault, inverted mirror images of the relations between the temporal historicity of economic production, anthropological finitude, and the end of history. In Nietzsche, Foucault writes, these become refigured in the death of God, the overman, and the promise-threat of Eternal Return, setting them all ablaze “in a light that may be either – we do not yet know which – the reviving flame of the last great fire or an indication of the dawn... It was Nietzsche, in any case, who burned for us, even before we were born, the intermingled promises of the dialectic and anthropology.” (MC 275/286)

[78] Cf. *Deleuze: An Apprenticeship in Philosophy* and Hardt’s foreword to the English translation of Deleuze’s *Nietzsche and Philosophy*.

[79] HD, xiii.

[80] Which, I must note again, is very different from the interpretation of Deleuze’s plane of immanence as the Outside as I illustrated in §4.2.2.

[81] Whereas arguably Deleuze reverses this relation in *Difference and Repetition*. “The Nietzschean synthesis, the eternal return, is a temporal synthesis that projects the Will to Power in time. Spinoza will show us, however, that the practice of joy takes place on the plane of society.” (HD 55) As Hardt writes, “the love of Ariadne for Dionysus is the affirmation of the eternal return it is a double affirmation, the raising of the being of becoming to its highest power. Dionysus is the god of affirmation, but it takes Ariadne to affirm affirmation itself... Aridane’s affirmation is a double affirmation (the ‘yes’ that responds to the ‘yes’)... Ariadne’s creation of pure being as is an ethical act, an act of love.” (HD 50) Even in *Commonwealth*, Hardt and Negri continue to develop a materialist philosophy bringing together Nietzsche’s critique of values and Spinoza’s ethics. Cf. HNC, 30.

[82] NP, n.a./x.

[83] HNC, 318.

[84] HNL, 20, 282-3.

[85] HNE, 73.

[86] HNE, 76.

[87] HNE, 430n12.
[88] Bacon's work is often critiqued in environmental ethics. See Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (New York, HarperOne, 1990)
[89] Cf. PP, 240-7/177-182.
[90] HNE, 89, xv, 23.
[91] Cf. also NOB, 51.
[92] Although, of course, one could just as easily argue that the foreclosure of an outside itself manifests a much more profound desire for purity.
[93] HNE, 41.
[94] In the context of *Empire*, however, the authors are referring to nuclear war, although the ecological implications therein are quite palpable. Cf. on this subject Michael Naas' "e-phemera: of deconstruction, biodegradability, and nuclear war" and Michael Peterson's "Responsibility and the Non(bio)degradable" in *Eco-Deconstruction: Derrida and Environmental Philosophy*. The final pages of the *Labour of Dionysus* frame this argument in slightly different terms, recalling that the distinction between immanent, constituent power and transcendent, sovereign, constituted power cannot be dialectically reconciled; the two processes will continuously confront one another in a moment that will "threaten the entire world with a moment of destruction and death. There is no guarantee that this threat will be made powerless; and, in any case, the construction of democracy by the multitude develops in this shadow of death." (HNL 311) Only a death threat, they write, stops revolution from being declared. "If there is a dialectic – the only dialectic possible – between the delusions of the power of the postmodern State and the construction of the democracy of the multitude, then it resides in this death threat." (HNL 312) The biopolitical production of new subjectivities and the affective production of immaterial labour develop in the subject's confrontation with death, where "it shows both its finitude and the insuppressible desire for life that animates it. The power of finitude is revealed therefore in this implacable struggle against death, against finitude itself." (HNL 312) But this finitude, they add, is precisely there where the transcendent power of human finitude and the constituent power of absolute immanence coincide. Freedom, they conclude, "can be realized only by breaking apart the alternatives of modernity and choosing the mortal risk implied in this break." (HNL 312) In fact, nothing seems to confirm better the precisely dialectical character of affirmative biopolitics.
[95] This distinction, however, has proven problematic to several interpretations of Spinoza and Deleuze see my note 60 in chapter 4 above.
[96] HNL, 290-1.
[97] Deleuze, for his part, seems to argue precisely the opposite: Foucault "stumbles on the question; is there anything beyond power? Is he not getting trapped in a sort of impasse within power relations? He was, you might say, mesmerized by and trapped in something he hated." (PP 148/109)
[98] HNL, 292.
[99] HNE, 388-9.
[100] NOB, 60.
[101] HNC, 56.
[102] NOB, 60.
[103] HNC, 5, 8, 29.
[104] The authors further target Agamben here: against his claim that "the only possibility of rupture resides in 'inoperative' activity (*inoperosità*), a blank refusal that recalls Heidegger's notion of *Gelassenheit*, completely incapable of constructing an alternative," ... "negat[ing] any constructive capacity of biopolitical resistance." (HNC 58)
[105] HNC, 178.
[106] NOB, 55.
[107] HD, 44, 47.
[108] HNE, 359.
[109] HNE, 269.
[110] EB, 141-2. See also E3, 8. "Nazism, by fulfilling and at the same time overturning the critique of the modern tradition, crushed the person into the individual and collective body that is its bearer... the elimination from human life of any transcendence with respect to its immediate biological given."
[111] EC, 28.
[112] EC, 5. One can see here already the necessary and impossible, the 'il faut' structure of the gift operates in Esposito as I showed in Derrida.
[113] EC, 6.

[114] ECI, xxviii.
[115] EC, 13.
[116] EB, 58, 46, 57.
[117] EI, 2, 7-8. "The immunitary logic is based more on a non-negation, on the negation of a negation, than on an affirmation. The negative not only survives its cure, it constitutes the condition of its effectiveness. It is as if it were doubled into two halves, one of which is required for the containment of the other: the lesser of two evils intended to block the greater evil, *but in the same language*." (EI 8*e*)
[118] EI, 8-9.
[119] EI, 18, 33.
[120] "To assume the will to power as the fundamental vital impulse means affirming at the same time that life has a constitutively political dimension and that politics has no other object than the maintenance and expansion of life." (EB 9)
[121] EB, 10.
[122] EI, 88. As Esposito cites Nietzsche, life in the ascetic ideal "wrestles in it and through it with death and *against* death; the ascetic ideal is an artifice for the *preservation* of life... The No [the human being] says to life brings to light, as if by magic, an abundance of tender Yeses; even when he wounds himself, this master of destruction, of self-destruction – the very wound itself afterward compels him to live." (EI 89)
[123] EB, 87.
[124] EB, 99.
[125] E3, 90.
[126] BS1, 435/327.
[127] Cf. VS, 188/143*t*. "For millennia, man remained what he was for Aristotle: a living animal with the additional capacity for a political existence; modern man is an animal whose politics places his life as a living being in question."
[128] EI, 142.
[129] Cf. Wolfe, *Before the Law*, 92.
[130] ECI, xxi-xxii.
[131] ECI, 14.
[132] As Esposito adds, "in [Simone] Weil this relation occasionally risks slipping into transcend*ence* [*trascendenza*]." (ECI 15) I prefer to think of this as a distinction between *transcendence* and the *transcendent*.
[133] ECI, 78, 75, 112-3.
[134] ECI, 113, 199-121.
[135] ECI, 127.
[136] EB, 157, 179.
[137] EB, 180.
[138] EB, 181.
[139] EB, 185.
[140] "Or better: the moving line that runs from the first to the second, constantly translating the one into the other." (EB 187)
[141] EB, 188.
[142] If the logic of the living is structurally impersonal and transindividual, "it is in this biojuridical node between life and norm that Deleuze invites us to *untie* in a form that, rather than separating them, recognizes the one in the other, and discovers in life its immanent norm, giving to the norm the potentiality [*potenza*] of life's becoming." (EB 194)
[143] E3, 14.
[144] E3, 18.
[145] E3, 125.
[146] "Identifying life with its own overcoming means that it is no longer 'in itself' – it is always projected beyond itself. But if life always pushes outside itself, or admits its outside within it, which is to say, to affirm itself, life must continually be altered and therefore be negated insofar as it is life." (EB 88)
[147] EC, 114.
[148] Cf. also EC, 125, 183.
[149] ECI, 176.
[150] ECI, 17.
[151] ECI, 197.

[152] *Fehlen uns die Namen*; the sea, Esposito writes, is an impossibility. "This is the sea, the eternal coming and going of waves, withdrawing as a counter-movement of the stroke, the undertow that leaves something on the earth, and vice versa, because the sea in question isn't to be understood in opposition to land, but rather as its secret meaning; the oscillating, precarious, and troubling dimension that constitutes the hidden undercurrent of land, that which land is incapable of seeing by itself, its blind spot." (ECI 110) See my note on 'general aqualogy' in chapter 4, note 60 for the elements of another project.
[153] ECI, 16.
[154] "'What it offers to thought is the essential gift, the prodigality of affirmation; an affirmation, for the first time, that is not a product (the result of a double negation), and that thereby escapes all the movements, oppositions, and reversals of dialectical reason, which, having completed itself before this affirmation, can no longer reserve a role for it under its reign. This event is hard to circumscribe. The interior experience affirms; it is pure affirmation and it does nothing but affirm. It does not even affirm itself, for then it would be subordinate to itself: it rather affirms affirmation.' This affirmation that 'affirms more than can be affirmed,' this 'more' that affirms 'only by an excess of affirmation,' or that affirms 'without anything being affirmed' (in the end 'finally affirming nothing'), is for Bataille the destiny (*not* the task) of community.'" (ECI 198)

Notes to chapter six: Translation as a Material-Semiotic in(ter)vention
[1] Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002).
[2] Luisa Maffi, "Linguistic, Cultural, and Biological Diversity" *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34 (2005), 602.
[3] MC, 58/47, 92-3/86-7, 97/92.
[4] MC, 136/132, 252/259.
[5] MC, 306/313, 309/323.
[6] BT, 20-1.
[7] "*Materially:* this is essential, this means *in its letter*." (BA 158)
[8] BT, 41.
[9] ED, 312/210.
[10] BT, 42.
[11] "Yes, the more a work resists translation, the more it attracts it... in this resistance, there is a mute call to translation." (BA 59)
[12] BT, 46.
[13] One could develop Berman's account at length here with that of speculation in its relation the *trans-* movements in "To Speculate: On 'Freud'" which stricturalize the economy of the pleasure principle.
[14] BA, 77.
[15] BT, 68, 74.
[16] Cf. LD, 69-70/52-3. Cf. also ED, 387/332-3. This is why Derrida is clear that there is an outside to language; the deconstruction of the representationalist thought of language does not entail a simple incontrovertibility of language. "Exactly the contrary. The question is that of everything that resists, precisely, the reference, the other, the event. The deconstruction of logocentrism consists exactly in saying that there is no convertibility, but nor is there simply incontrovertibility of closure of language upon itself, autoreference." (EA 9*t*)
[17] Cf. MP, 292/329.
[18] Donna J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (London, Routledge, 1991), 164.
[19] Peter Mühlhäusler, *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region* (London, Routledge, 1996).
[20] Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women,* 164 emphasis added.
[21] Ibid., 187. My bracketing of the specifically feminist concerns of Haraway's work are merely due to limitations in space, although its irony is noted. One interested in the complicity between traditional models of science and patriarchy and their shared dominations of women and nature is encouraged to turn to the rich literature in ecofeminism, especially the work of Marti Kheel, Carolyn Merchant, Val Plumwood, and Karen Warren.
[22] Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*, 176.
[23] Ibid., 196.
[24] Peter Mühlhäusler, *Language of Environment, Environment of Language* (London, Battlebridge, 2003), 60.
[25] Ibid.,
[26] Peter Mühlhäusler, *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region* (London, Routledge, 1996), 276.
[27] Ibid., 322.

[28] David Harmon, *In Light of Our Differences: How Diversity in Nature and Culture Makes us Human*. (Washington, Smithsonian Institute, 2002), 165.
[29] Quoted in Sune Vork Steffensen, "Language, Ecology, and Society: An Introduction to Dialectical Linguistics." in Jørgen Christian Bang and Jørgen Døør, *Language, Ecology, and Society: A Dialectical Approach* (New York, Continuum, 2007), 5. Emphasis added.
[30] Einar Haugen, *The Ecology of Language*. (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1972), 325.
[31] As David Crystal writes in *Language Death*, "The two-way relationship with ecology needs to be developed: not only does an ecological frame of reference enter into language discussion, language issues need to become part of general ecological thinking." David Crystal, *Language Death*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000), 98.
[32] Michael Cronin, *Translation and Globalization* (London, Routledge, 2003), 144.
[33] Frans C. Verhagen, "Ecolinguistics: A Retrospect and a Prospect." in*ECOnstructing Language, Nature, and Society: The Ecolinguistic Project*, eds. Bernhad Kettemann and Hermine Penz, (Tübingen, Stauffenburg Verlag, 2000), 40-1. This collection unfortunately has nothing to say about deconstruction, or in David Wood's old appellation 'econstruction' (now eco-deconstruction) and ecolinguistics.
[34] I opt for material-semiotic over material-discursive however to avoid the common confusion of arche-writing or general text with the 'linguistic turn' by which everything becomes discourse.
[35] As I showed in §4.1, Heidegger was well aware of this risk in Nietzsche. Barad clearly distinguishes her understanding of agency from such a framework; "(the granting of agency is an ironic notion, no?)." Karen Barad, "Interview with Karen Barad," in *New Materialisms: Interviews &Cartographies*, eds. Rick Dolphijn and Iris van der Tuin (Ann Arbour, Open Humanities Press, 2012), 55
[36] Michael Cronin, *Translation and Identity* (London, Routledge, 2006), 26. Cf. also ibid., 21.
[37] Martha Cheung, "For 'Theory' to 'Discourse': the Making of a Translation Anthology," in Theo Hermans, ed. *Translating Others (2 Volumes)*. (Manchester, St Jerome Press, 2006), 93.
[38] Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation* (London, Routledge, 1998), 1.
[39] Ibid., 26-7.
[40] Ibid., 21-2.
[41] Rom Harré, Peter Mühlhäusler and Jens Brockheimer, *Greenspeak: A Study of Environmental Discourse*. (London, Sage University Press), 139.
[42] Bang and Døør, *Language, Ecology, and Society*, 208.
[43] Ibid., 44.
[44] Peter Mühlhäusler, *Language of Environment, Environment of Language*, 53, 199.
[45] Peter Mühlhäusler, *Linguistic Ecology*, 3.
[46] Peter Mühlhäusler, *Language of Environment, Environment of Language*, 64, 39. As I cited in the introduction to chapter 3, "language surrenders itself to our mere willing and trafficking as an instrument of domination over beings. Beings themselves appear as actualities in the interaction of cause and effect. We encounter beings as actualities in a calculative businesslike way, but also scientifically and by way of philosophy, with explanations and proofs." (GA *9* 318/243)
[47] See Freya Mathews, *The Ecological Self* (London, Routledge, 1991) and Val Plumwood, *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* (London, Routledge, 1993) among others.
[48] Harmon, *In Light of our Differences*, 17.
[49] Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, (London, Routledge, 1995), 6-7.
[50] Ibid., 17.
[51] Cf. ibid., 304. Cf. also Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation* (London, Routledge, 1998), 29.
[52] Michael Cronin, *Translation and Globalization,* 39.
[53] On this, see Jonathan A. Abel, "Translation as Community: The Opactiy of Modernizations of Genji monogatari," in *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*, eds. Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005), 147.
[54] Judi Wakabayashi and Rita Kothari, eds. *Decentering Translation Studies: India and Beyond*. (Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2009), 13, emphasis added.
[55] Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, *Linguistic Genocide in Education- Or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* (Mahwah, Erlbaum, 2000), 360; "Linguistic Human Rights in Education for Language Maintenance," in Luisa Maffi, ed. *On Biocultural Diversity: Linking Language, Knowledge, and the Environment*. (Washington, Smithsonian Institute Press, 2001), 400. A seemingly infuriated Translation Studies scholar accused me of biologism in arguing for the mourning of languages, saying that languages die out all the time. This is, of course, the same argument used by those who note that species have always died out, so why ought we care about biodiversity?

Which is great insofar as it totally avoids any responsibility for the anthropogenic intensification of the eradication of biocultural diversity.

[56] Harré, Muhlhausler, and Brockheimer, *Greenspeak*, 159.

[57] The difficulty with such an analysis, of course, is as much the danger of engaging extremely complex scientific frameworks as an argument from authority, wherein quantum 'weirdness' becomes a justification for any counter-intuitive claim (see Barad on this) as the blanket rejection and grouping of all traditional models of science into the same politically nefarious ideology; such a discourse repeats an itself quite traditional separation between new and old, one wonderfully amenable to technocapitalist enframing (see again Barad on this). This is a risk, of course, of which I am also guilty. However, a few examples of how ecolinguistics and translation theorists engage ideas from quantum physics may be important here. Citing the work of Halliday and Martin, Mühlhäusler explains that physics in the 20th Century has entailed shifts from absolute to relative, object to process, determinism to probability and from stability to flow. (*Language of Environment, Environment of Language*, 98.) Alexis Nouss argues that translation operates in 'connivance' with the relativism of contemporary epistemology as outlined by Heisenberg and Bohr. (Alexis Nouss, "In Praise of Betrayal," in Anthony Pym, ed. *The Return to Ethics*, special issue of *The Translator* 7, no. 2 (2001): 284) For Cronin, the quantum duality of wave and particle better represent the translator as a particle both fixed in space and time and traversed by wave-like currents of cultural and linguistic influence. Such an image, he argues, expresses "the necessity for non-reductionist approaches to global hybrids such as translation." (Cronin, *Translation and Identity*, 22) The shift from the 'materialism' of the Bacon-Descartes-Newton approach towards interests of holistic spiritual and ecological democracy is also suggested by Steffensen in his introduction to dialectical linguistics ("Language, Ecology, and Society," 28) Halliday argues that the concepts of dualism, determinism, individualism and objectivism continue to present apparently insurmountable barriers to an ecological sustainable relationship with the earth's biocultural diversity, indeed arguing that these concepts are framed by the very structure of SAE languages. (M.A.K. Halliday, "New Ways of Meaning: The Challenge to Applied Linguistics" in *The Ecolinguistics Reader*, Alwin Fill and Peter Mühlhäusler, eds. (London, Continuum, 2001) As Halliday recounts, both Bohr and Heisenberg had famously expressed their dissatisfaction with the rigidity of scientific language, arguing that "natural language in its everyday spoken form... has precisely the flux and fluidity, the playful quality (i.e. elasticity, with lots of 'play' in it), the indeterminacy and the complementarity that the scientists say is required to construe the universe in its post-quantum state." (Ibid., 190) Another option involves learning from other languages and their grammatical constructions of reality. George Steiner in *After Babel* recounts that Whorf claimed that the grammar of Hopi was better suited to quantum mechanics. "According to the conception of modern physics, the contrast of particle and field of vibrations is more fundamental in the world of nature than such contrasts as space and time, or past, present, and future, which are the sort of contrasts our own language imposes upon us. The Hopi aspect-contrast... being obligatory upon their very forms, practically forces the Hopi to notice and observe vibratory phenomena, and furthermore encourages them to find names for and to classify such phenomena." (George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation (Third Edition)* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1998), 94.

[58] Bruno Latour, *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes: Essai d'anthropologie symétrique* (Paris, La Découverte, 2006); trans. Catherine Porter as *We Have Never Been Modern* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1993). See Derrida on 'modernity' in *The Ear of the Other*, 115/84 in note 27, chapter 5.

[59] Latour, *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes*, 15/7. Ariadne returns here from my chapter on Nietzsche: "More supple than the notion of system, more historical than the notion of structure, more empirical than the notion of complexity, the idea of network is the Ariadne's thread of these interwoven stories." (Ibid., 10/3) Latour's use of the term 'network' is drawn from his own work in Actor Network Theory, also influential in Translation Studies, although I will have to problematize the notion of 'actor' below. Collaborator Michel Callon's "Éléments pour une sociologie de la traduction: La domestication des coquilles Saint-Jacques et des marins-pêcheurs dans la baie de Saint-Brieuc," *L'Année sociologique* 36, no. 3 (1986): 169-208 is influential both therein and in Translation Studies.

[60] Latour, *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes*, 49/52.

[61] However, mediation ought not to be understood in a dialectical sense; dialecticians are the greatest representatives of modern thought for Latour since their mediations only refer to pure ontological qualities, "either of the spirit, in its right-wing version, or of matter, in its left-wing version." Ibid., 77/57. Dialectics abolishes and sublates the relation between nature and culture in the *aufhebung*.

[62] Ibid., 22/11, 52-3/34.

[63] "Everything happens in the middle, everything passes between the two, everything happens by way of mediation, translation, and networks, but this space does not exist, it has no place. It is the unthinkable, the unconscious of the moderns." Ibid., 57/37.

[64] Ibid., 176/129, 184/135. Curiously, the English translation removes the term 'déconstruction' in this context and replaces it with *constructivism*.
[65] Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*, 3.
[66] Ibid., 3-4.
[67] Ibid., 201.
[68] Latour, *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes*, 132/97.
[69] Ibid., 97/71.
[70] Ibid., 134-5/98-9.
[71] Ibid., 141/104.
[72] "One that can be partially shared and friendly to earth-wide projects of finite freedom, adequate material abundance, modest meaning in suffering, and limited happiness." Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*, 187.
[73] Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*, 191.
[74] Ibid., 193.
[75] Ibid., 196.
[76] Ibid., 208-9.
[77] Latour, *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes*, 175/128.
[78] Ibid., translation modified. One could evoke Derrida's discussion of Heidegger on representation in 'Envoi,' here, but let me attempt to think this out otherwise.
[79] Ibid., 176/129.
[80] Latour adds that 'delegation' would be another name for this transcendence without contrary; "the utterance [*l'énonciation*], or the delegation, or the sending of a message makes it possible to remain in presence – that is, to exist." Ibid.,
[81] Bruno Latour, *Politiques de la nature: Comment faire entrer les sciences en démocratie* (Paris, La Découverte, 2004); trans. Catherine Porter as *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2004), 172/122.
[82] Ibid.,
[83] Ibid., 175/125.
[84] Ibid., 177/126.
[85] Ibid.,
[86] Karen Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning* (Durham, Duke University Press, 2007), 59.
[87] Arkady Plotnitsky, *Complementarity.* (Durham, Duke University Press, 1994), 75, 37, 2, 1.
[88] Ibid., 8.
[89] "In quantum mechanics, one must always deal with the fact that irreducible losses in the representation of the behaviour of quantum systems to take place and that one must relate both one's interpretation and theory to these losses, which can only be done by means of general economy." Ibid., 72
[90] Ibid., 72.
[91] Ibid., 251.
[92] Ibid., 58.
[93] "Traces or traces of traces – translations without the originals. All putative origins of such traces-translations – that is, all possible representations of processes whose effects appear as traces – can only be seen as supplements in Derrida's sense. Complementarity is theory in the age of quantum mechanical reproduction, and, at a certain sense, all reproduction is quantum mechanical, for example, that to which Benjamin refers to as 'mechanical reproduction.'" Ibid., 95
[94] Ibid., 29.
[95] Ibid., 115.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Ibid., 28; The interruption of the cut tears through the restricted economy of the living present; indeed Plotnitsky suggests we think of material efficacity in complementarity as issuing from a past that has never been present and an impossible future-to-come. "Absolute past suspends the possibility of objects existing by themselves and in themselves, independently of interpretation, as much as the possibility of full representation." (Ibid., 109)
[98] See her "Ecologies of Nothingness" in *Eco-Deconstruction: Derrida and Environmental Philosophy*.
[99] Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*, 26.
[100] Ibid., 138.

[101] Karen Barad, "Interview with Karen Barad," in Rick Dolphijn and Iris van der Tuin, eds. *New Materialisms: Interviews &Cartographies*. (Ann Arbour, Open Humanities Press, 2012), 52.
[102] Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*, 133. See my above note 33, however, concerning my preference for the material-semiotic over the material-discursive.
[103] Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway,* 195.
[104] Ibid., 33.
[105] Ibid., 44-5, 139.
[106] Ibid., 45.
[107] Ibid., 177.
[108] Ibid., 148.
[109] Ibid., 205.
[110] Barad, "Interview with Karen Barad," 49.
[111] Ibid., 52.
[112] One versed in the literature in the ethics of translation will perhaps anticipate what is at stake here by way of analogy or metaphor, but it is necessary to stress that thinking translation as what Barad calls an epistemological-ontological-ethical framework means that the physics at play here are precisely not analogous, or rather, analogy and metaphor, as well as their alleged opposition in the proper scientific Concept are themselves effects of the originary structure of life-death which constitutes the material-semiotic. See §1.3.1 and §1.4.1 above. Plotnitsky similarly writes that in both general economy and in complementarity, a general metaphoricity is irreducible. As he cites Derrida's "White Mythology," writing "explode[s] the reassuring opposition of the metaphoric and the proper, the opposition in which the one and the other have never done anything but refer to each other in their radiance." (MP 323/270-1)
[113] Ibid., 69. It would appear at first blush that Barad's own conception of '*agential* realism' remains incompatible with the questions of radical passivity I've engaged throughout, particularly as she distinguishes her theory of performativity as one that takes into account matter's dynamism, as opposed to others which would simply reinscribe matter's classical passivity. My own materialist argument in §3.1.3 rather suggested that thinking a not only mortal but dead matter at the heart of any organic or inorganic individuation opened onto a shared passivity more amenable to ecological ethics. However, Barad remains vigilant in distinguishing her theory from one that would simply extend human agency to the nonhuman. The terms 'agent' and 'actant' work against the relational ontology she is interested in developing "(the granting of agency is an ironic notion, no?)." (Ibid., 55) She thus distances herself from the readings of Latour that have been so fruitful for object-oriented ontology, radically differentiating her argument from the democratic distribution of agency across humans and nonhumans. Agency is not a property somebody or something has, but rather the enactments through which entanglements become reconfigured. (Ibid., 56, 55) But even this notion of en*act*ment, one equally importantly taken up in discussions of autopoiesis, can bear too close a resemblance to what I've called performativity in the narrow sense in some of the literature; too bound to the sovereignty of an 'I can,' both necessary and sufficient to bring about its event (an event it would thus immediately neutralize).
[114] Ibid., 69.
[115] Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*, 335.
[116] Vicki Kirby, *Quantum Anthropologies: Life at Large* (Durham, Duke University Press, 2011).
[117] Ibid, 83.
[118] Ibid., xi.
[119] Ibid., x-xi.
[120] Kirby, "Un/Limited Ecologies, Unpublished Manuscript in *Eco-Deconstruction*, 9.
[121] Ibid., 10
[122] See my above note 16, where Derrida is clear that his thought of *physis* in différance implies that there is an outside to language.
[123] Kirby, *Quantum Anthropologies*, 35.
[124] Ibid., 7.
[125] Sergey Tyulenev independently arrives at this same refiguration of Luhmann in *Applying Luhmann to Translation Studies* (London, Routledge, 2011).
[126] Wolfe, *Critical Environments*, 53.
[127] Wolfe, *Animal Rites,* 81. Recalling an early discussion between Maturana and a friend, Tyulenev distinguishes *poiesis*, the giving of oneself to creation, from *praxis*, "to take action and follow the path of arms." (in *Applying*

Luhmann to Translation Studies, 26) One could further develop this notion by flagging the deconstructive notion of *giving* oneself here, and particularly ecologically in terms of the *munus*.
[128] Wolfe, *Critical Environments*, 60.
[129] Wolfe, *Animal Rites*, 8.
[130] Niklas Luhmann, *Social Systems*. (Stanford, Stanford University Press), 37.
[131] Ibid., 79. Maturana and Varela echo this: "the relation between linguistic domains, the emergence of language per se, and species is dynamic and fluid, one of degree and not one of kind." Cf. Wolfe, *Animal Rites*, 83.
[132] Ibid., 11.
[133] Ibid., 9
[134] Wolfe, *What is Posthumanism?*, xv
[135] Ibid., 47.
[136] Ibid.,
[137] Ibid., 60. Recalling, as I have above, that a text only lives on if both totally translatable and totally untranslatable, and indeed the viroid structure of this logic, Wolfe draws on David Wills's definition of the viral, "within and between the ontological pretention of an *is* and the thetic possibility of an *in*" to explain this relationship between system and environment. "That relation is not an 'ontological pretention of an *is*' but a *functional* distinction, a temporally dynamic, recursive loop of systems code and environmental complexity that is itself infected by the virus of paradoxical self-reference, a 'thetic *in*' (to use Wills's terms) that will always constitute a 'blind spot' and generate and 'outside' for its own (or any) observation. For this reason... 'reality,' in Luhmann's words, 'is what one does not perceive when one perceives it." Ibid, xix. What I read above as the necessity to think the (restricted ecology) of the machine and the advent of the impossible event (general ecology, impossibly and stricturally binding the two together) is thought by systems theory "all at once as a deconstructive enfolding of the difference between the system's iterative self-reference and the fleeting temporality of the event from the 'outside' – a difference that [...] serves as the very basis for the system's autopoiesis." Ibid., 10.
[138] I'm of course playing on 'the environment' both in relation to its opposition to the system in systems theory and in the general parlance of environmental philosophy.
[139] Humberto R. Maturana and Francisco J. Varela, *The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding, Revised Edition* (Boston, Shambhala, 1998), 135-6.
[140] Wolfe, *Critical Environments*, 59.
[141] Ibid., 66.
[142] Ibid., 70.
[143] Cary Wolfe, "Wallace Stevens' Birds, or, Derrida and Ecological Poetics." Unpublished manuscript to be included in Fritsch, Lynes and Wood, eds. *Eco-Deconstruction: Derrida and Environmental Philosophy*. Under review by Fordham University Press, 8-9.
[144] Ibid., 9.
[145] Wolfe, *What is Posthumanism*., 96.
[146] Wolfe, *Critical Environments*, 77.
[147] Cited in Wolfe, *Critical Environments*, 79.
[148] Wolfe, *What is Posthumanism*, xxviii.
[149] Ibid., 81.
[150] I'd also shown Berman suggest this as translation's *dépassement de sens*.
[151] Itamar Even-Zohar, "Polysystem Studies," in *Poetics Today* 11,1 (1990): 4, 9, 13.
[152] Anthony Pym, ed. *The Return to Ethics.* Special issue of *The Translator* 7,2 (2001): 134; Maria Tymoczko. "Reconceptualizing Western Translation Theory: Integrating Non-Western Thought About Translation," in *Translating Others*, 21.
[153] Tyulenev, *Applying Luhmann to Translation Studies*, 47.
[154] Ibid., 16, 61.
[155] Ibid., 81.
[156] Ibid., 8.
[157] Ibid., 61, 148, 83.
[158] Ibid., 167.
[159] Ibid., 64. emphasis added
[160] Ibid., 167.
[161] Ibid., 147, emphasis added.
[162] Ibid., 61.

[163] Ibid., 64.
[164] Ibid., 81.
[165] And one can recall here that Latour precisely speaks of translation, the network, and mediation as the 'navette' of the non-modern constitution.
[166] Ibid., 188.
[167] Ibid., 187. Converts in(ter)vention into in(*tra*)vention, with all the aneconomic movements of *tr*-, transgression, transcendence.
[168] Ibid., 190.
[169] Ibid.
[170] Mühlhäusler, *Language of Environment, Environment of Language*, 60
[171] Ibid., 24.
[172] Halliday, "New Ways of Meaning," 179.
[173] Ibid., 179.
[174] Mühlhäusler, *Language of Environment, Environment of Language*, 140.
[175] Steiner, *After Babel*, 300, xiv.
[176] Ibid., 77.
[177] Ibid., 228, 238.
[178] Ibid., 246.
[179] Cf. ibid., xiv and PM2, 118-9.
[180] Ibid., 239.
[181] Harmon, *In Light of our Differences*, 138.
[182] Halliday, "New Ways of Meaning," 191.
[183] Ibid., 194-5. See also James E. Lovelock, "Gaia as Seen through the Atmosphere," *Atmospheric Environment* 6, no. 8 (1972): 579-80. Bruno Latour also has a recent book on Gaia, *Face à Gaïa : Huit conférences sur le nouveau régime climatique* (Paris, La Découverte, 2015).
[184] Halliday and Martin, cited in Andrew Goatly, "Green Grammar and Grammatical Metaphor, or Language and Myth of Power, or Metaphors we Die by," in *The Ecolinguistics Reader*, 204, 218. The debate between Halliday and Goatly in *The Ecolinguistics Reader* would be a wonderful opportunity to bring ecolinguistics into the debates between process philosophy and object-oriented philosophy, respectively.
[185] This discussion is not to be confused with the process of marking in systems theory, which is precisely the reverse, a system marks what belongs to it and leaves its outside unmarked.
[186] Halliday, "New Ways of Meaning," 193.
[187] Harré, Mühlhäusler, and Brockheimer, *Greenspeak*, 119.
[188] Steiner, *After Babel*, 137.
[189] Saroj Chawla, "Linguistic and Philosophical Roots of our Environmental Crisis," in *The Ecolinguistics Reader*, 117.
[190] John Weiner, "Property, Agency, Time, Culture, Spirit," in *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity: A Complementary Contribution to the Global Biodiversity Assessment*, Darrell Addison Posey, ed. (London, Intermediate Technologies Publications and United Nations Environment Programme, 1999), 101.
[191] Chawla, "Linguistic and Philosophical Roots of our Environmental Crisis," 117. It would be interesting to examine Bergson and Husserl in this respect.
[192] Steiner, *After Babel*, 165.
[193] Ibid., 165-6.
[194] Christi A. Merrill, "The Afterlives of Panditry: Rethinking Fidelity in Sacred Texts with Multiple Origins." in *Decentering Translation Studies*, 68.
[195] Samuel Weber, "A Touch of Translation: On Walter Benjamin's 'Task of the Translator.' In Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood (eds.), *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005), 73.
[196] Mühlhäusler, *Language of Environment, Environment of Language*, 134.
[197] See, for example, Harré, Mühlhäusler, and Brockheimer, *Greenspeak*, 137; Mühlhäusler, *Language of Environment, Environment of Language*, 140; Darrell Addison Posey, "Introduction: Culture and Nature – the Inextricable Link," in *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*, 7; Eric A. Smith, "On the Coevolution of Cultural, Linguistic, and Biological Diversity," and Stanford Zent, "Acculturation and Ethnobotanical Knowledge Loss among the Piaroa of Venezuela," both in *On Biocultural Diversity*, 103, 181.
[198] Mühlhäusler, *Linguistic Ecology*, 310.

[199] Harmon, *In Light of our Differences*, 91.
[200] Posey, "Introduction: Culture and Nature: The Inextricable Link," 7.
[201] Luisa Maffi, "Linguistic Diversity," in *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*, 30.
[202] Ibid.,
[203] Maffi, "Language, Knowledge, and Indigenous Heritage Rights," in *On Biocultural Diversity*, 415.
[204] "The essentialist's conception of author springs from the doctrine of 'possessive individualism' and embraces the 'hero inventor' quality of authorship." Stephen B. Brush, "Protectors, Prospectors, and Pirates of Biological Resources," in *On Biocultural Diversity*, 526.
[205] See on this Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation*, 47-66.
[206] Jeffrey Wollock, "Linguistic Diversity and Biodiversity: Some Implications for the Language Sciences," in *On Biocultural Diversity*, 253.
[207] L. Jan Slikkerveer, "Ethnoscience, 'TEK' and its Application to Conservation," in *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*, 169.
[208] Posey, "Biological and Cultural Diversity: the Inextricable, Linked by Language and Politics," in *On Biocultural Diversity,* 385.
[209] Mühlhäusler, *Language of Environment, Environment of Language,* 145.
[210] Maffi, "Language, Knowledge, and Indigenous Heritage Rights," 421.
[211] Posey, "Biological and Cultural Diversity," 382.
[212] Cronin, *Translation and Globalization*, 25.
[213] Ibid., 424.
[214] Harmon, *In Light of our Differences*, 72.
[215] Ibid.
[216] Ibid.,161.
[217] Bang and Døør, *Language, Ecology, and Society*, 72.
[218] Steffensen, "Language, Ecology, and Society: An Introduction to Dialectical Linguistics," 27.
[219] Harmon, *In Light of our Differences*, 155.
[220] Michal Zellermayer, "On Comments made by Shifts in Translation," in *Translation across Cultures*, ed. Gideon Toury (New Delhi, Bahri Press Private, 1998), 78.
[221] Fritjof Capra, "Reconnecting the Web of Life: Deep Ecology, Ethics, and Ecological Literacy," in *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*, 492.
[222] Cronin, *Translation and Globalization*, 167.
[223] Ibid., 4.
[224] Ibid., 156.
[225] Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility* (London, Routledge, 1995), 18.
[226] Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 20.
[227] Ibid., 20.
[228] Cronin, *Translation and Globalization*, 162.
[229] Ibid., 6.
[230] Ibid., 45.
[231] James A. Nash, "On Bioresponsibility," in *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*, 472.
[232] Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, "Linguistic Human Rights in Education for Language Maintenance," in *On Biocultural Diversity*, 399.
[233] Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, *Linguistic Genocide in Education – Or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* (Mahwah, Erlbaum, 2000), 655. Of course, to think of biodiversity as the rights of humans to biodiversity is a common position in environmental ethics, but one that, at least in my view, betrays a serious anthropocentrism.
[234] Ibid., 483.
[235] Ibid.
[236] Ibid., 665-6.
[237] Maffi, "Language, Knowledge, and Indigenous Rights," 152.
[238] Bang and Døør, *Language, Ecology, and Society*, 176.
[239] Ibid., 177.
[240] Latour, *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes*, 176/129.
[241] Meschonnic, *Éthique et politique du traduire* (Paris, Verdier, 2007); trans. Pier-Pascale Boulanger as *Ethics and Politics of Translating* (Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011), 123/118.
[242] Weber, "A Touch of Translation," 74.

[243] Cronin, *Translation and Globalization*, 4.
[244] Tyulenev, *Applying Luhmann to Translation Studies*, 187.
[245] Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 24.
[246] Wolfe, *What is Posthumanism?,* 122.
[247] Ganesh Devy, "Foreword," in *Decentering Translation Studies*, xi.
[248] To conclude in leaving open the citational doubling that is the general text of general ecology, biocultural life death on earth; "for J. Hillis Miller, such is the effect of translation: 'Use of translation uproots the work, denatures it, transforms it into a *hortus siccus*, or dried, specimen flower ready to be stored in the bottomless archives.' The denaturing and transformation evoked here are not exclusive to the work of translation. To return to Benjamin, a book of citations (and no book is ever free of citation) is a veritable *hortus siccus*, a desiccated garden, which makes thought grow." Michael Marder, *The Philosopher's Plant: An Intellectual Herbrarium* (New York, Columbia University Press, 2014), xvi-xvii.

Notes to In-Conclusion

[1] Edmund Husserl, *Ideen zur einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Zweites Buch: Phänomenologische Untersuchungen zur Konstitution* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1952); trans. Richard Rojcewicz and André Schuwer as *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy: Second Book: Studies in the Phenomenology of Constitution* (Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989).
[2] Martin Heidegger, *Besinnung* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1997); trans. Parvis Emad and Thomas Kalary as *Mindfulness* (London, Continuum, 2006), Martin Heidegger, *Die Geschichte des Seyns* (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1998); trans. Jeffrey Powell and William McNeill as *The History of Beyng* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2015).
[3] Félix Guattari, *Les Trois écologies* (Paris, Galilée, 1989); trans. Ian Pindar and Paul Patton as *The Three Ecologies* (London, the Athlone Press, 2000), and Félix Guattari, *Qu'est-ce que l'écosophie?* (Fécamp, Éditions Lignes/IMEC, 2013).